





















BC✓

THE  
AMERICAN  
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY  
REVIEW

Under the Direction of  
MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS { RT. REV. MGR. JAMES F. LOUGHLIN, D. D.  
RT. REV. MGR. JAMES P. TURNER, D. D., V. G.

---

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum  
veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive  
confitentem. S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

---

VOLUME XXXII.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1907.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY  
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

---

PHILADELPHIA :

211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

Entered according to Act of Congress,  
in the year 1907,  
By P. J. RYAN,  
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at  
Washington, D. C.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

	PAGE
Abyssinia, The Church in—R. F. O'Connór.....	145
Angelico, Fra—E. Leahy.....	67
Aveling, D. D., Rev. Francis. The Progress of Thought and the Catholic Faith.....	256
Aveling, D. D., Rev. Francis. The Thought-Value of Proof: An Eronicon.....	435
Barry, Rev. David. Some Criticisms on "Supernatural Religion"	224
Boyd, J. F. The French Ecclesiastical Revolution. 167, 269, 511, 641	
Brigittine Monasteries—Darley Dale.....	425
Buddha, St. Francis and—Rev. Leo L. Dubois, S. M.....	193
Bullen, S. J., Rev. Joseph. The Men of the Great Synagogue.	298
Cardinal King, Henry IX., The—William F. Dennehy.....	1
Catholic Church to the Art of Music, The Relations of the—Rev. Edward F. Curran.....	592
Catholic Faith, The Progress of Thought and the—Rev. F. Aveling, D. D.....	256
Catholic Point of View in Philosophy—Rev. William Turner..	402
Catholic View of Hamlet, A—Rev. William Devlin, S. J.....	239
Catholicity, A French View of English—J. Faber-Scholfield.	355, 385
Catholicity in Spenser—E. Rickey.....	490
Christ, The Trial of Jesus—Rev. Wilfrid Lescher, O. P.....	251
Church in Abyssinia, The—R. F. O'Connor.....	145
Church in the Middle Ages, Geography and the—James J. Walsh, M. D.....	49
Courtesy, Mediaeval—Darley Dale.....	123
Curran, Rev. Edward F. The Relations of the Catholic Church to the Art of Music.....	592
Currier, Rev. Charles Warren. When Did Israel Go Out of Egypt? .....	82

	PAGE
Dale, Darley. Brigittine Monasteries.....	425
Dale, Darley. Mediæval Courtesy.....	123
de Capitan, Rev. F. A Parish in Picardy.....	17
de Courson, Barbara. Some Recently Beatified Martyrs.....	340
de Courson, Barbara. The French Clergy During the Reign of Terror.....	577
Dennehy, William F. The Cardinal King—Henry IX.....	1
Devlin, S. J., Rev. William. A Catholic View of Hamlet.....	239
Dubois, S. M., Rev. Léo L. St. Francis and Buddha.....	193
Dwight, S. J., Rev. Walter. St. Cyprian and the “Libelli Mar- tyrum” .....	478
Ecclesiastical Revolution, The French—J. F. Boyd. 167, 269, 511, 641	
Egypt? When Did Israel Go Out of—Rev. Charles Warren Currier .....	82
Encyclical Letter—To the French.....	138
Encyclical Letter—Modernism.....	683
English Catholicity, A French View of—J. Faber-Scholfield. 355, 385	
Faber-Scholfield, J. A French View of English Catholicity. 355, 385	
Folghera, O. P., Rev. T. D. God’s Happiness and Ours.....	502
Fra Angelico—E. Leahy.....	67
France, Loss and Gain in—Abbé Hermeline.....	666
French Clergy During the Reign of Terror, The—Barbara de Courson. ....	577
French Ecclesiastical Revolution, The—J. F. Boyd. 167, 269, 511, 641	
French Missioners in India—R. F. O’Connor.....	604
French Revolution, Pius VI. and the—Donat Sampson.....	94, 313
French View of English Catholicity, A—J. Faber-Scholfield. 355, 385	
Geography and the Church in the Middle Ages—James J. Walsh, M. D.....	49
God’s Happiness and Ours—Rev. T. D. Folghera, O. P.....	502



*Table of Contents.*

v

	PAGE
Hamlet, A Catholic View of—Rev. William Devlin, S. J. ....	239
Hannon, John. Side Lights on the Child-Life of Our Lord...	465
Heneghan, John. The Reformation in Ireland Up to the Death of Henry VIII. ....	73 <sup>I</sup>
Henry IX., The Cardinal King—William F. Dennehy. ....	I
Hermeline, Abbé. Loss and Gain in France. ....	666
Hickey, E. Catholicity in Spenser. ....	490
Hitchcock, S. J., Rev. George S. The Magnificat, Its Author and Meaning. ....	623
India, French Missioners in—R. F. O'Connor. ....	604
Innocent III.—John I. Mullany. ....	25
Ireland Up to the Death of Henry VIII., The Reformation in— John Heneghan. ....	73 <sup>I</sup>
Irish Ecclesiastical Policy, A Recent Indictment of—John J. O'Shea ....	538
Irony of Shakespeare, The—Rev. James Kendal, S. J. ....	450
Israel Go Out of Egypt? When Did—Rev. Charles Warren Currier ....	82
Kendal, S. J., Rev. James. The Irony of Shakespeare. ....	450
Leahy, E. Fra Angelico. ....	67
Lescher, O. P., Rev. Wilfrid. The Trial of Jesus Christ. ....	251
Loss and Gain in France—Abbé Hermeline. ....	666
Magnificat, Its Author and Meaning—Rev. George S. Hitch- cock, S. J. ....	623
Martyrs, Some Recently Beatified—Barbara de Courson. ....	340
Matrimony, Decree Concerning Sponsalia and. ....	75 <sup>I</sup>
Mediaeval Courtesies—Darley Dale. ....	123
Men of the Great Synagogue, The—Rev. Joseph Bullen, S. J. .	298
Middle Ages, Geography and the Church in the—James J. Walsh, M. D. ....	49
Monasteries, Brigittine—Darley Dale. ....	425

	PAGE
Mullany, John I. Innocent III.....	25
Music, The Relations of the Catholic Church to the Art of—Rev. Edward F. Curran.....	592
New Theology, Old Superstition and Modern Science—John J. O'Shea .....	211
O'Connor, R. F. French Missioners in India.....	604
O'Connor, R. F. The Church in Abyssinia.....	145
O'Shea, John J. A Recent Indictment of Irish Ecclesiastical Policy .....	538
O'Shea, John J. New Theology, Old Superstition and Modern Science .....	211
Parish in Picardy, A—Rev. F. de Capitain.....	17
Philosophy, The Catholic Point of View in—Rev. William Turner .....	402
Picardy, A Parish in—Rev. F. de Capitain.....	17
Pius VI. and the French Revolution—Donat Sampson.....	94, 313
Progress of Thought and the Catholic Faith, The—Rev. F. Aveling, D. D.....	256
Recent Indictment of Irish Ecclesiastical Policy, A—John J. O'Shea .....	538
Reformation in Ireland Up to the Death of Henry VIII., The— John Heneghan.....	731
Relations of the Catholic Church to the Art of Music, The—Rev. Edward F. Curran.....	592
Revolution, The French Ecclesiastical—J. F. Boyd. 167, 269, 511, 641	
St. Cyprian and the "Libelli Martyrum"—Rev. Walter Dwight, S. J.....	478
St. Francis and Buddha—Rev. Leo L. Dubois, S. M.....	193
Sampson, Donat. Pius VI. and the French Revolution.....	94, 313
Shakespeare, The Irony of—Rev. James Kendal, S. J.....	450
Side Lights on the Child-Life of Our Lord—John Hannon....	465
Some Criticisms on "Supernatural Religion"—Rev. David Barry	224



# Table of Contents.

vii

PAGE

Some Recently Beatified Martyrs—Barbara de Courson.....	340
Spenser, Catholicity in—E. Hickey.....	490
“Supernatural Religion,” Some Criticisms on—Rev. David Barry	224
Syllabus, The New—Latin and English.....	556
Synagogue, The Men of the Great—Rev. Joseph Bullen, S. J..	298
Thought-Value of Proof: An Eironicon, The—Rev. F. Ave- ling, D. D.....	425
Trial of Jesus Christ, The—Rev. Wilfrid Lescher, O. P.....	251
Turner, Rev. William. The Catholic Point of View in Phil- osophy .....	402
Walsh, M. D., James J. Geography and the Church in the Middle Ages.....	49
When Did Israel Go Out of Egypt?—Rev. Charles Warren Currier .....	82

## BOOKS REVIEWED.

Benedicenda—Schulte .....	384
Bienheureuse Varani—Rambuteau.....	184
Bienheureux Fra Angelico—Cochin.....	184
Blind Sisters of St. Paul—De la Sizerane.....	762
Casuist, The.....	378
Catholic Encyclopedia.....	374
Consecranda—Schulte .....	186
De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis—Kern.....	766
Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels—Hastings.....	377
Doctrine de la Predestination—Van Oppenray.....	381
Eglise et l’Orient au Moyen Age—Brehier.....	190
Geschichte der Paepste—Pastor.....	574
Goddess of Reason, The—Johnson.....	764

	PAGE
Guillaume I.—Terlinden.....	376
History of the Books of the New Testament—Jacquien.....	760
History of the Society of Jesus in North America—Hughes...	573
Indexed Synopsis of the "Grammar of Assent"—Toohey.....	380
Ireland Under English Rule—Emmet.....	567
Larger Catechism—Byrne.....	189
Madame Louise de France—De la Briere.....	763
Meditations for the Secular Clergy—De Goesbriand.....	379
Meditations on Christian Doctrine—Bellord.....	767
Medulla Fundamentalis Theologiae Moralis—Stang.....	383
Origines du Style Gothique en Brabant—Lemaire.....	383
Questions d'Histoire et d'Archeologie Chretienne—Guirard...	191
Religious Persecution in France—Brodhead.....	575
Saint Theodore—Marin.....	184
Studies in Irish History.....	384
Ten Lectures on the Martyrs—Allard.....	761
Theologie Sacramentale—Pourrat.....	188



# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors." (Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

---

VOL. XXXII.—JANUARY, 1907—No. 125

---

## THE CARDINAL KING.—HENRY IX.\*

"Here's a health to the King whom the Crown does belong to;  
Confusion to those who the right King would wrong so;  
I do not here mention either Old King or New King;  
But here is a health, boys—a health to the True King!

"Here's a health to the Clergy, true sons of the Church,  
Who never left King, Queen or Prince in the lurch;  
I do not here mention either Old Church or New Church;  
But here is a health, boys—a health to the True Church!"  
Jacobite Song.

SEVERAL biographies have been published at various periods of His Eminence the Cardinal, Duke of York, and His Royal Highness Prince Henry Stuart, second son of the Old Pretender, King James III of Great Britain, France and Ireland, the only son of the unfortunate James II and of his devoted, holy and self-sacrificing wife, Marie Beatrix d'Este. The eldest brother of the Cardinal was the once chivalrous Prince Charles Edward Stuart, the Young Pretender, whose nearly successful attempt to recover the throne of his ancestors in 1745 has formed the theme of much song and story. It is doubtful, however, if any more interesting record of the life of the Prince Car-

---

\*The last of the Royal Stuarts: Henry Stuart, Cardinal Duke of York, by Herbert N. Vaughan, B. A. (Ovan) London, Methuen Co., 1906.

dinal has ever been produced than that which now stands to the credit of Mr. Herbert Vaughan, upon whose valuable stores of information concerning a charming personality I now propose to draw.

The Old Pretender—James III—was married to Maria Clementina Sobieska, co-heiress with her sister, the Princess Maria Charlotte Sobieska, of the Royal Polish House of Sobieska. The latter married Charles Godefroi de la Tour, Duc de Buillon, descendant of the famous Crusader King of Jerusalem. Queen Maria Clementina, to give her her rightful title recognized by the Holy See and by all Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen who clung to the Jacobite belief in the eventual certainty of the re-establishment of the Stuart dynasty, was a woman of remarkable religious characteristics, whose scrupulous sense of the obligations of morality was sorely tried by the conduct of her royal husband, who appears to have inherited the worst frailties of his father, King James II, and to have imitated in some degree the example set him by his licentious but admittedly worldly wise uncle, King Charles II. Maria Clementina, on the other hand, was devoted to ascetic practices, carried to a pitch which is asserted to have aggravated an internal disease from which she suffered and which brought about her death at the early age of thirty-three years, in 1735. Fifteen years previously, on the last day of 1720, her eldest son, Charles Edward, Prince of Wales, was born in the Palazzo Muti, Rome, the residence assigned James III by Pope Clement XI on the exiled monarch seeking a home in the Eternal City. The building in question was capacious, if not remarkable for architectural beauty, and within its walls the legitimate King of Great Britain and Ireland maintained the semblance of a royal court. Before its doors a squadron of Papal cuirassiers daily mounted guard, in precisely the same fashion as their comrades did at the portals of the Vatican and the Quirinal. All the honors due to a reigning sovereign were rendered to the refugee Prince, and he was accorded the precedence appertaining to his titular dignity at all the ceremonies and receptions of the Papal court.

In the Palazzo Muti, on March 6th, 1725, Henry Benedict, Duke of York, was born. At this period the reigning Pontiff was Pope Benedict XIII and James lost no time in communicating to His Holiness news of an event which created unbounded satisfaction in Jacobite circles, and corresponding depression amongst the adherents of the Hanoverian dynasty, not only in England, but also in Rome, where—even at the College of Car-



dinals—King George had friends who thus early realized the hopelessness of a Stuart restoration. In virtue of his inherited prerogatives, James at once conferred on his second son the title of Duke of York, a dignity the validity of which, curiously enough, was never questioned even in England. As soon as the Pope received the announcement of the birth of the Prince he repaired to the Palazzo Muti in full panoply of state. Mr. Vaughan records that on the arrival of the Pontiff “the delighted monarch, advancing to meet his august visitor with the newborn baby in his arms, proudly exhibited the young Prince with these words: ‘I present the Duke of York to Your Holiness, that you make him a Christian.’” The Sacrament of Baptism was immediately afterwards administered by the Pope in the private chapel of the palace, no less than twelve names being bestowed on the infant, of which four only, Henry Benedict Maria Clement, were ever made use of by the future Cardinal—Henry in memory of eight English Kings, Benedict in honor of the Pontiff, and Maria Clement out of respect for his Polish mother. Later in the day every Cardinal resident in Rome called on James II in order to congratulate him on the birth of the Duke of York.

It is noted by Mr. Vaughan, as a singular coincidence, that the birth of the Duke of York synchronized with the occurrence of serious disagreement between his father and mother. Almost on the eve of the birth of the child James, with singular callousness, had grievously offended his wife by appointing as his Secretary of State the Earl of Inverness. Rightly or wrongly, the Queen had formed the impression that Lady Inverness had supplanted her in the affections of her husband and was furiously indignant at what she viewed as something worse than an ordinary disregard of her feelings to neglect of which she seems to have been pretty well accustomed. A proposal, seriously entertained by James, that the child should be removed from Rome, to be brought up in Spain, still further incensed the Queen. This notion was not carried into effect, but within twelve months after the birth of the Duke of York, Her Majesty left her husband and went to reside in a Ursuline Convent close to the Palazzo Muti, where she remained until Lord and Lady Inverness put an end to an intolerable and disgraceful situation by removing from the Eternal City. The reconciliation between the royal couple, such as it was, did not take place until February, 1728, when the Queen was already stricken by the malady which terminated her earthly existence in January, 1735. As to the intensely religious character of Maria Clementina abundant evidences exist, and it

is said that her ascetic practices largely contributed to the breaking down of her health. The poor Queen had long endured cruel anxiety regarding the personages to whom her more careless husband was willing to confide the education of her sons, her main care being to secure that their tutors should be orthodox Catholics. This requirement satisfied, Her Majesty seems to have paid but slight attention to the question of merely scholastic attainments. It is, however, unjust to argue on this point, as Mr. Vaughan does, from the fact that the eldest son, Charles Edward, Prince of Wales, was always sadly deficient in orthographical knowledge of the English language. This circumstance was quite compatible with a fair acquaintance with the classics, as well as with French and Italian. The teachers finally selected for the two Princes were Sir Thomas Sheridan, a Catholic Irishman, and the Abbe Legouz, of the University of Paris.

Mr. Vaughan, who seems to find it hard to treat Maria Clementina with ordinary generosity, says that:

"Her intense spirituality and neglect of all mundane interests, qualities that were certainly out of place in one who was at once a queen, a wife and a mother of children, had long unfitted her to dwell in a practical, unkind world. Though for the last seven years of her existence she had dwelt under her husband's roof the pair had in reality lived wholly apart for ten years. Stuart King was ever absorbed in his endless political schemes, whilst his consort, suffering equally in mind and body, had grown to care for nothing except her good works in Rome, nor did she pay any attention to her sons' upbringing, save at such times as her suspicious nature led her to detect the dreadful Protestant influence of the Prince's governor, James Murray, titular earl of Dunbar."

To ordinarily fair-minded persons the characteristic last alleged will scarcely seem discreditable. When the poor Queen died she was accorded a magnificent funeral by command of the then Pope, Clement XII, the Vatican Basilica, in the crypt of which her body was laid, being draped in black velvet adorned with the regal escutcheons of England, Scotland, Ireland and Poland. The procession to the Basilica had been composed of squadrons of Papal troops, of the members of the College of Cardinals, of all the religious and secular notabilities of Rome, and of the many confraternities of the city. We read:

It was commonly reported that formal application would some day be made to obtain the Beatification of the late Queen on account of her severe piety and extensive works of charity, and particularly as her confessor, the noted Father Leonard of Port Maurice (afterwards beatified and canonized) had latterly superintended her many benevolent schemes amongst the destitute and sinful of Rome. But no such plea seems ever to have been formally advanced although the reported sanctity of John Sobieski's granddaughter evidently came to be regarded as efficacious in her native Poland for there is included amongst the "Stuart Papers" a curious account of a Polish nobleman's child being healed of a putrid fever," through her direct intervention.



That Queen Maria Clementina was an extremely holy woman is unquestionable, and the story of the life of her youngest son would seem to attest that over him, at any rate, her example must have exercised a considerable influence for good.

Mr. Vaughan says that as his two sons increased in years James began to initiate them into all the intricacies of his perpetual schemes and intrigues, both boys expressing the greatest eagerness to recover their grandfather's lost crown. It would have been strange if things had been otherwise. Whatever the personal faults of James, he was undoubtedly an affectionate father, a man of decidedly religious turn, like his own parent, James II, and that he honestly endeavored to bring up his sons under moral influences is quite certain. That he was disappointed in the case of the Prince of Wales is an unfortunate fact, but he had, at least, the satisfaction of knowing that his fondest hopes were fulfilled by the Duke of York. So early as the year previous to the death of his mother, Charles Edward served his first apprenticeship to the art of war, at the siege of Gaeta, whither he was brought by his cousin, the Duke of Liria, and where he gave ample proofs of the possession of the military courage he afterwards constantly manifested. The two lads, while still little more than children, mingled in all the gayeties of Roman society, which was one of the most brilliant in Europe, and demeaned themselves in a fashion which onlookers recognized as worthy of scions of a royal house. An impartial French visitor to Rome, M. Charles de Brosses, has left an interesting account of the mode of life at this period of James III and his two sons. He wrote:

The King of England is treated here with as much respect as though he were a real reigning sovereign. He lives in the Piazza die Santi Apostoli in a large palace not remarkable for beauty. The Pope's soldiers mount guard there as at Monte Cavallo and accompany him whenever he goes out, which is not often the case. It is easy to recognize him for a Stuart, of which family he has every trait; for he is tall and lean and in fact strongly resembles the portraits we have in France of his father, King James the Second. He is also very like Marshal Berwick, his natural brother, except that the Marshal's face was sad and severe while that of the Pretender is sad and silly.

\* \* \* The Pretender's dignity of manners is extraordinary. I never beheld any Prince preside over a great assembly so well and so gracefully. Yet his life in general is very retired and he only comes for an hour to take part in the entertainments he occasionally provides to the ladies of Rome for the amusement of his sons. He is pious in the extreme and he passes much of every morning in prayer at his wife's monument in the Church of the Santi Apostoli. Of his talents my own lack of information forbids me to speak with certainty; they do not appear to me to be great, but his conduct is reasonable and his behaviour dignified. Although I often have the honor to see him it is but for a moment on his return from church, for he then retires to his own chamber until dinner time. He speaks seldom at that meal, but always courteously and pleasantly, and he withdraws from the room as soon as dinner is finished. \* \* \* When he sits down to dinner his two sons before seating themselves go to kneel before him for his blessing. He usually

speaks to them in English, but to the others in Italian or French. The young princes have a small supper in the evening at which the King never appears.

Such was the manner of life at the Palazzo Muti, and it seems a pity that dynastic and political ambitions should ever have changed the even tenor of its course. De Broses formed a higher opinion of the abilities of Charles Edward than of those of his brother Henry, and there appears to be little doubt that, regarded from a purely worldly standpoint, the former was the more distinguished and soldierly of the two. Events were to prove, however, that the latter possessed many qualities far more valuable than those which won so much admiration for the Prince of Wales.

The turning point in the careers of the two young men was rapidly approaching. Quarter of a century had elapsed since the disastrous ending of their father's attempt to recover the crown of Great Britain and Ireland, when the outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession brought the Stuart claims once more within the domain of practical politics. England was already at loggerheads with Spain, when the aggressive action of the Elector of Bavaria towards the Queen-Empress Maria Theresa brought about a European conflict. Spain and France were on the side of the Bavarian Prince. So, too, was the King of Naples. It was a case of the Bourbons against the rest of the world. England, on the other hand, backed Maria Theresa, and Tuscany acted similarly. Frederick of Prussia made a grab for himself in the midst of the general confusion and occupied Silesia, and Charles Emmanuel of Sardinia, following his example, invaded Lombardy, hoping to wrest it from Spain, which then claimed to rule. The only neutral states were the Republic of Venice and the Papacy. The fates seemed propitious for the Stuarts. Both France and Spain were eager to see a blow struck against the Hanoverian King of England, whose German interests alone had induced him to oppose their policy towards Austria. Mr. Vaughan's method of describing the situation at Rome and elsewhere at this period can scarcely be regarded as entirely accurate, but neither can it be condemned as wholly wrong so far as it deals with actual facts. Where he errs is in the imputing of motives where wholly different causes of action might at least equally correctly be alleged. However, this may be, he cites as follows:

In Rome itself there existed side by side two antagonistic parties, the stronger of which upheld the claims of the Bavarian Prince and sympathized with Bourbon aggression, whilst the weaker, that included some of the most astute and able politicians, \* \* \* such as Cardinal Alessandro Albani, himself a connection of the Austrian Imperial House, openly declared in favor



of Maria Theresa and her husband. The Stuart Court naturally sided with the Bourbon faction for it was to the monarchs of France and Spain that James had ever looked for the outside assistance that was absolutely essential for the success of his own restoration. \* \* \* For some time past Charles had been carefully studying the European situation and it seemed to his youthful, eager mind that the favorable moment for action had at last indeed arrived when the cautious and pacific Cardinal Fleury died, and there arose to power at Versailles Cardinal Tencin, \* \* \* genuinely enthusiastic in his support of the Stuarts.

It was not, however, merely on the prospect of help from France and Spain that James and his sons knew they could rely in making an effort to recover the throne of the realms which they believed to be rightly theirs. Not only were Ireland and Scotland largely Jacobite, but even in England itself there existed a considerable body of opinion—not among the masses, but among politicians—favorable to a Stuart restoration.

Under such favorable conditions Prince Charles Edward embarked on the most glorious, if the only glorious, adventure in his career. It was necessary, of course that he should make his way to the court of the French King, and his journey thereto was made with the utmost secrecy, in order to guard against interruption by the many agents and friends of the Hanoverian King who were vigilantly watching his movements in Rome and elsewhere. Some of the latter indeed were to be found amongst the members of the Sacred College. The arrangements for the departure of the Prince of Wales were made with so much secrecy that even his brother, Prince Henry, knew nothing about them. His Royal Highness arrived in Paris at the end of January, 1744. Remaining more than two months in the French capital, while an expedition to England was being organized under command of the famous Marshal de Saxe, the Prince eventually set out with that great master of the art of war, in one of the best vessels of a splendid fleet, which carried a large army to invade his ancestral dominions. Scarcely, however, had the flotilla left Dunkirk than a violent storm arose. In the result those of the transports which were not wrecked were either captured or destroyed by the British, whose ships had practically control of the Channel. No more striking example of the efficiency of sea power, about which Captain Mahan has written so much, is recorded in military or naval history. Bitterly disappointed though Charles Edward was, at what had occurred, he was determined at any risk to make personal appeal to the people of Great Britain to support his cause. Eventually, as every one knows, he was successful so far as landing in Scotland and in bringing about the marvelous display of bravery and loyalty on the part of the Highland clans and their chiefs which ended so disas-

trously at Culloden. The earlier successes of the Prince of Wales, overthrowing as he did all the British troops which attempted to bar his progress, naturally filled the hearts of his father and brother with hope and pride. The latter insisted on being allowed to proceed to France, with a view to his accompanying a French force which King Louis was assembling at Dunkirk to send to Scotland to support the Prince of Wales. Mr. Vaughan says:

"On his arrival at Versailles Henry, who was introduced at Court by his cousin, the Duke de Fitz-James, was well received by Louis and treated with the full dignity due to a younger son of a reigning King. \* \* \* As soon as possible he proceeded to his assigned post, the nominal command of the forces collected at Boulogne, Dunkirk and other ports."

The Duke of York's actual headquarters were fixed at the second named place, and here he spent many weary months surrounded by as dissolute a military staff as even the court and army of Louis would produce.

The truth appears to be that Henry was utterly disgusted by the conduct of his comrades, with whom he had absolutely nothing in common. Instead of joining in their revels he spent hours at his devotions, and when their orgies were running fast and furious he was kneeling before the tabernacle in some silent church. To the Duke de Richelieu—who was the real commander of the French troops—"the Italian bigot," as he styled him, was well-nigh incomprehensible. "You may perhaps gain the Kingdom of Heaven by your prayers," he remarked angrily one day to the Duke of York, who by attending mass had kept a council of war waiting, "but never the kingdom of Great Britain." It does not appear, however, that the pious Prince neglected any of his proper military duties and it is certain that he was sorrow-stricken by the inaction forced upon him by the fact that the prowess of the British squadrons made the Channel an English lake. At length the end of a fretful and wearisome time came with the tidings of Culloden and the eventual return of the fugitive Prince of Wales, with whom Henry journeyed to Paris, where both took up their residence. During his stay in Scotland and his maintenance there of a semblance of a royal court, Charles Edward appears to have lived a wild and dissipated life, and it is to be feared that his conduct in the French capital was no better. As a consequence the brothers became more and more alienated, until at last Henry resolved on a step he had long been contemplating. This was neither more nor less than to return to Rome with a view to seeking admission to holy orders. His father was the confident of his dearest hopes,

and it is to the immortal credit of James III that, so far from endeavoring to dissuade his son from taking a course which he was too astute not to know must, in the then state of Protestant feeling in England be almost ruinous to the Stuart cause in that country, he actually aided him to accomplish his desire. Knowing that the Prince of Wales was quite capable of resorting to violent means to prevent his leaving Paris for the purpose he had in mind, the Duke of York maintained complete secrecy towards him, and in order to evade suspicion of his design, actually sent him an invitation to dinner at his residence at Clichy for the evening of the day he left for the frontier. Charles Edward, acting on the note, repaired to Clichy, where he was alarmed and puzzled to find a splendid repast and the usual retinue of servants, but no brother. Eventually he returned to Paris where the next day he learned what had happened, although it was not for some weeks that he ascertained the actual cause of Henry's departure. The information was conveyed to him by his father in a letter which shows quite plainly that he realized how seriously the decision arrived at by his youngest son, after much consultation, prayer and thought, was likely to affect the dynastic and political interests of the family. The communication in question was a very human document, full of pathos, and indicative of a rightful sense of both paternal and religious duty. It read as follows:

Albano, June 13, 1747.

I know not whether you will be surprised, my dearest Carlucchio, when I tell you that your brother will be made a Cardinal the first days of next month. Naturally speaking you should have been consulted about a resolution of that kind before it had been executed; but as the Duke and I were unalterably determined on the matter, and as we foresaw you might probably not approve of it, we thought it might be showing you more regard and that it would be even more agreeable to you that the thing should be done before your answer could come here and to have it in your power to say it was done without your knowledge and approbation. It is very true I did not expect the Duke here so soon, and that his tenderness and affection for me prompted him to undertake that journey; but after I had seen him, I soon found that his chief motive was to discourse with me fully and freely on the vocation he had long had to embrace an ecclesiastical state, and which he had so long concealed from me and kept to himself with a view, no doubt, of having it in his power of being of some use to you in the late conjunctures. But the case is now altered; and as I am fully convinced of the sincerity and solidity of his vocation, I should think it a resisting of the Will of God, and acting directly against my conscience if I should pretend to constrain him in a matter which so nearly concerns him. \* \* \* The resolution is taken, and will be executed before your answer to this can come here. If you think proper to say you were ignorant of it and did not approve of it, I shall not take it amiss of you; but for God's sake, let not a step which naturally should secure peace and union amongst us for the rest of our days become a subject of scandal and *eclat* which would fall heavier upon you than upon us in our present situation, and which a filial and brotherly conduct in you will easily prevent. \* \* \* God bless my dearest Carlucchio whom I tenderly embrace—I am all yours.

JAMES R.



So far from Charles Edward displaying the "filial and brotherly conduct" implored by his father, he indulged in violent denunciations of all concerned in proceedings, the effect of which in his personal interests in England, he only too acutely and accurately realized. For years he declined to communicate with either James III or the Duke of York, refrained from visiting Rome, and plunged into the course of drunkenness and dissipations—only briefly interrupted by a fruitless and loveless marriage—which culminated in a pretended perversion to Protestantism and the ruining of his health.

Mr. Vaughan reminds the readers of his interesting work that Henry Stuart was by no means the first English prince to enter the religious life. Odo of Bayeux, and Henry of Winchester, in Norman times, may perhaps be considered as statesmen rather than bishops; but of the royal line of Plantagenet, Henry Beaufort, son of John of Gaunt, and Reginald Pole, grand-nephew of King Edward IV, and last Papal Archbishop of Canterbury, had both been raised to the purple. We are further told that:

On June 30th, 1747, the Duke of York received the tonsure at the hands of the Pontiff in the chapel of the Stuart palace and in the presence of his father and all the members of the Jacobite Court. Four days later, on July 3rd, he proceeded, in full state, to the Vatican where, at the altar of the Sistine Chapel he accepted the Scarlet Hat of a Cardinal Deacon from Benedict XIV. The ceremony ended, the Pope pronounced an allocution to the many Cardinals present wherein he alluded most pointedly to the royal rank and the eminent virtues of this new member of the Sacred College. In the course of his address, Benedict dwelt at some length upon the sacrifices made at various times by King James III for the Catholic faith, and upon the good works and redoubtable piety of the late Queen Clementine, predicting from her noble example that the son of such a pair was destined to become an ornament, not only to the College of Cardinals, but to the whole Church.

The Pontiff's prognostication was abundantly fulfilled. During the month of August, 1788, the Duke of York received the four Minor Orders, together with the Orders of Sub-Deacon and Deacon. On the 1st of September he was ordained Priest, and on the great Feast of Our Lady, on the 8th of September, he celebrated his first mass in his father's domestic chapel. On the festival of the Holy Innocents he celebrated his first Missa Cantata in the Sistine Chapel, James III and twenty-two Cardinals being present. Moved, no doubt, by wise motives, the Pontiff simply showered honors and emoluments on the now Cardinal Priest. He bestowed on him the high and remunerative office of Arch-Priest of the Vatican Basilica. In the same year Louis XV, who had not improperly expelled Charles Edward from Paris, in exercise of the utterly wrong prerogatives he enjoyed as dispenser of ecclesiastical preferment in France, conferred on him the wealthy Abbacies of Auchin and St. Amand, the revenues of

which amounted to about £6,000 sterling, or, say, \$30,000 annually. The Pope also nominated the Cardinal Duke as the holder of the office of Camerlengo, in the event of his own death, which took place in May, 1758. The Duke, in this capacity, played an important part in no less than four conclaves held for the election of successive Pontiffs. It is related of him that, in the first of these assemblies, he strongly supported the claims of the Cardinal whose election was desired by Austria, declaring to his father, who sought to influence him in favor of Cardinal Carlo Rezzonico, of Venice, that "he had rather lose his head than do anything against his conscience." He adopted this line of conduct, he said, although he was not left unaware that the Bourbon patrons of himself and his family desired the election of the Venetian Cardinal. The conclave lasted no less than four months and finally resulted in the election of Cardinal Rezzonico, who was crowned Pope under the title of Clement XIII. The new Pontiff showed his chivalrous sense of the impartiality of the Cardinal Duke by immediately re-conferring on him the dignity of Camerlengo, which,—in accordance with custom—he had resigned at the close of the election. This was on July 16th, 1758, and in a consistory held in October following the new Pope created him Archbishop of Corinth *in partibus infidelium*. Furthermore, Clement XIII, in July, 1761, bestowed on the Duke the then richly endowed Bishopric of Frascati, near Rome. Six years later the same Pope appointed the Cardinal Bishop of Frascati to be Vice-Chancellor of the Holy See. In addition to his bishopric, his French abbeys, and his Papal offices, the Cardinal owned rich prebends in Mexico and Spain, so that his income ranged between £30,000 and £40,000 a year, or \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Nothing is more clearly proven than that the Cardinal Duke of York applied practically every penny of this huge income in acts of private and public beneficence. He cared nothing for money for its own sake. It is true that he maintained semi-regal state, asserting his right to rank as a royal prince, but he never forgot his duties as a Priest and Bishop, and even the humblest member of his flock could gain admission to his presence. He built and endowed a college for the education of ecclesiastical students, bestowing on it a splendid library. He erected churches and chapels and, so far as he could, he made the whole community within his jurisdiction sharers in his prosperity. Meantime his own life was one worthy of his sacred office and no breather of scandal has ever dared to sully his name. As

Vice-Chancellor he maintained a residence in the Cancellaria at Rome, another in closer proximity to the Vatican, his episcopal palace at Frascati, and a summer abode, the Villa Muti. In 1769 he presided over a second conclave, on the death of Clement XIII, and in his capacity as Vice-Chancellor exercised his prerogative, during the Papal interregnum, of issuing coins from the Roman mint bearing his own effigy. In the midst of all this pomp and power, of active religious and beneficent labor, the Cardinal was constantly tortured by brotherly anxiety for the spiritual and material welfare of his dissipated brother, who for years refused to hold communication with him or their father, and over whose general course of conduct it is as well to draw a veil. On the accession of Benedict XIV the Vice-Chancellorship was not re-conferred on the Duke of York until some years after the death of James III, which took place on the 1st of January, 1766. The exiled King had long suffered from an incurable internal complaint, but his demise was not expected at the time it occurred. In his dying moments, however, he received all the consolations of the Church and there is no doubt that he had during many years lived a life which must in the mercy of the Most High have largely atoned for all the errors and frailties of the past. His devoted son, the Cardinal Prince Priest, knelt by his death-bed. The funeral was conducted with all the panoply of royal state befitting the obsequies of a sovereign, but this was the last occasion on which the Papal authorities recognized the royal claims of the Stuarts. There was good reason for this. The heir to the claims which James III had maintained was a man wholly unworthy of the throne of England even if he could have conquered it. Later on, when he died, to have lent active support to a Catholic and Cardinal claimant to rule a nearly wholly Protestant realm would have been something worse than absurd and could only have inflicted irreparable injury on the interests of the Church, not only in that country, but also in Ireland and Scotland.

The Cardinal had long sought to induce Charles Edward to come to Rome, where he evidently hoped his influence might lead to an amendment of conduct which sadly needed correction. All his efforts, however, proved vain until the death of James III created in the mind of Charles III—as the dissipated Prince now dubbed himself—the notion that the Pope might receive and entertain him in the same fashion as he had harbored and subsidised his father and mother. Nothing, however, could have been further from the mind of the Pontiff and his advisers, but



the Cardinal long refused to believe that this could be the case, and he exhausted expostulation and supplication in an effort to secure recognition of the rank of his brother as a reigning monarch. The Holy See, happily, was not made a party to any such arrant humbug and imposture. The day when Stuarts could reign had passed away just as the era when Bourbon rule, carrying with it as it did all kinds of parasitic abuses, was hastening to a close. The Cardinal Duke, however, could not see the absurdity of the Pontiff continuing to make the restoration of an impossible dynasty a portion of his policy in dealing with a generally friendly Protestant nation which absolutely rejected the aforesaid dynasty. Consequently he bombarded the Pope and his ministers with petitions in which he pointed out "the indispensable necessity for the Holy See to recognize at this moment the House of Stuart as the only true and legitimate sovereigns of the kingdom of England." Clement XIII, however, was not to be led into an act of folly which would have most seriously affected Catholic interests not only in Great Britain and Ireland, but also in America, Canada and the West Indies. Notwithstanding this state of things, Charles III determined to proceed to Rome. Mr. Vaughan says:

On January 23rd, the eagerly expected news was brought that Charles Stuart, under the incognito of plain John Douglas, was nearing the city and the Cardinal Duke at once setting out to meet him, found him waiting for fresh horses at an inn some miles from the *Porte del Popolo*. The meeting between the two royal brothers, after nearly nineteen years of estrangement at the mean hostelry on the *Flaminian* road, would afford an interesting subject for an historical picture for there is eloquent pathos to be found in the marked change that had occurred both in their appearance and circumstances since they had last met. In the soured, bloated, middle-aged man, with legs so swollen as to need assistance, the Cardinal Duke must have been shocked to recognize the handsome, brilliant youth, full of fire and confidence, who had once conquered Scotland; whilst in the stately prince of the Church, with flowing robes and jewelled cross the Chevalier must have found greatly altered the timid, wayward boy who had deserted him years ago in Paris.

It would appear that, influenced by the Cardinal Duke, the heads of the English and Scotch Colleges, as well as of the Irish Dominicans and Franciscans, in Rome welcomed Charles III in their respective establishments with royal honors, acclaiming him King of Great Britain and Ireland, but each of the personages in question promptly received a Papal missive politely pointing out that their speedy removal from the Eternal City would be most agreeable to the Holy Father. Needless to say, they went, and there were no more regal receptions for King Charles. He and his devoted brother had to make the best of a bad situation. Moreover, the Pope ordered the removal of the royal arms of Great Britain and Ireland from the entrance to the *Palazzo Muti*,

in which he permitted Charles to reside in succession to his father, and the mandate was duly carried out. There was no denial of refuge to the exile Prince, but he was sternly refused permission to masquerade as a sovereign with his court in Rome.

The Cardinal must have often regretted the presence of his brother in Rome. His Majesty King Charles III was constantly drunk, but whether drunk or sober he was pursued by creditors who, when they failed to obtain money from him, generally importuned His Eminence. Seeing that the Duke of York had already surrendered in favor of Charles his own pension of 12,000 crowns paid by the Papal treasury, and was aiding him in other ways, it is scarcely matter for wonder that he eventually refused to be made paymaster of his brother's extravagances. In February, 1769, Clement XIII died and was succeeded by Clement XIV, the unfortunate Cardinal Ganganelli, the record of whose occupancy of the Papal chair remains forever stained by his submission to the dictation of the Bourbons in the matter of the suppression of the Society of Jesus. For a while Charles cherished the hope that Clement XIV would recognize him as King, but the poor, timorous Pontiff was the man least likely to take a step which, however foolish, would have demanded courage. The dissipated Prince had to remain content with the title of Duke of Albany, save within the precincts of the Cardinal's episcopal palace at Frascati, where he was always received with the ceremonies and honors due to a reigning king. On this point the Duke of York was as adamant. He not only regarded Charles as King of England, but himself as heir to that position. Probably one of the cruellest tragedies ever perpetrated in the way of royal marriages was the wedding on April 17th, 1772, of the wretched, sottish Charles to the beautiful but brainless Princess Louise Maximilienne Caroline Emmanuele, daughter of the deceased Prince Gustavus Adolphus of Stolberg-Gedern. The Cardinal was kept in ignorance of the negotiations which led up to this most unhappy union, but, although bitterly annoyed when he heard that it had been decided upon, he overcame his prudential and resentful feelings and determined to endeavor to do his best to secure the permanence of the alliance. Accordingly he did all that lay in his power to accord the newly wedded pair a royal reception on their arrival in Rome from Macerata, Ancona, where the marriage ceremony had taken place. We are told by Mr. Vaughan that:

The Cardinal Duke despatched his Chamberlain, the Marchese Angeleli, with his state coach-and-six to meet them at the Ponte Molle the ancient bridge

that spans the Tiber to the north of St. Peter's. With their four couriers riding in advance, with their outriders in scarlet liveries and with their own and the Cardinal Duke's equipage, "their Majesties the King and Queen of Great Britain, France and Ireland," were enabled to make a tolerably imposing entrance into the city where at the Porta del Popolo and in the Corso a large crowd of idlers had assembled. On the following day (April 23rd) the Cardinal Duke drove into Rome in person in order to pay his compliments to his sister-in-law.

No one could possibly have acted with more kindness or tact, but the marriage was doomed to unhappiness from the outset.

There is no need to recount in these pages the history of a wretched alliance, suffice to say that no series of events in the life of the Cardinal Duke stands out more abundantly to his credit than those in which he played a fatherly, as well as a priestly, part in endeavoring to avert the scandals which resulted in the separation of a nearly equally erring husband and wife. Probably, of the two, Charles Edward was the least base. He at any rate made no attempt to hide his faults. The Princess, however, was mean enough to trade on the generosity of the kindly, simple Cardinal, and while sheltered in one of his palaces to allow all others to know that she had forgotten the sacredness of the marriage vow. Naturally, when the Duke of York came to learn of these facts, the refuge thus abused was denied her. It is impossible, however, to read the narrative of what happened without realizing that the holy Cardinal was essentially a lovable and paternal character. If his solicitude for the spiritual and material welfare of his brother and sister-in-law could have lifted them to better life than both lived, their sad story had not been what it was. The Princess, after many wanderings, died in Florence in January, 1824, drawing to the last an annuity for the payment of which the Cardinal had charged his own estate in order to enable her to maintain the dignity of a Dowager Queen of England. After their legal separation by mutual agreement, Charles had definitely fixed his residence at Florence, whither he called his natural daughter whose mother was a Scottish lady who had been his companion in his campaign of 1745, and whom he had brought to France. The girl in question he created Duchess of Albany and proclaimed his legitimate heir. Her mother's name was Clemintina Walkinshaw. The new-made Duchess showed intense devotion to her broken-down father and undoubtedly exerted herself to the uttermost to cheer the declining years of his sad existence. Suffering though she was from an incurable internal malady, she brought a new light into his gloomy surroundings and exercised an influence over him which was essentially good and religious in its nature. On Jan-



uary 30th, 1788—the anniversary of the execution of his great-grandfather at Whitehall—Charles III died in the Palazzo Muti, Rome, in which his mother and father had died before him. By his death-bed two Irish Franciscans—Father James and Father Francis McCormick—watched and prayed. To the very last he was affectionately tended by Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Albany, the title which he had bestowed upon her, and which was recognized by the Papal court and that of France.

Immediately after the demise of his brother, the Cardinal caused a medal to be struck bearing his own effigy, surrounded by the abbreviated inscription, "Hen. IX. Mag. Brit. Fr. et Hib. Rex. Fid. Def. Card. Ep. Tusc." Translated, at length, these abbreviations stand for "Henry the Ninth, of Great Britain, France and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, Cardinal, Bishop of Tusculum." On the reverse of the medal appeared a female figure, symbolizing Religion supporting a large cross with the British lion couched at her feet, where also lay a royal crown and a Cardinal hat. While His Eminence thus asserted his royal dignity the Pontiff much to his chagrin, refused to recognize him as a reigning monarch and he was compelled to remain content with being received at the Papal court as being what he undoubtedly was, a Prince of the Church. The splendid days of benevolent affluence and learned ease, as well as of devoted pastoral effort, were, however, rapidly coming to an end for the Cardinal as for many others. On February 10th, 1798, the forces of Revolutionary France, under the command of General Berthier, occupied Rome, and the population of Frascati having become inoculated with the wild ideas of universal equality of which the soldiers of the First Republic were at once the propagators and the contradiction, the Cardinal Duke was compelled to seek refuge in Naples, then still the capital of an independent kingdom. Here he remained ten months, at the expiration of which he removed successively to Messina, Trieste, and finally to Venice, all the time in sore straits through poverty. In September, 1799, Cardinal Stefano Borgia, moved to pity by his necessitous condition, appealed to Sir John Hippisley, who had long acted as an unofficial representative of Great Britain in Rome, but who was then resident in London, for monetary assistance from the British government for the Cardinal Duke. It is to the immortal credit of King George III that the moment the facts of the case were brought under his notice he obtained an annual pension of £4,000 sterling for the rival claimant of his throne, who still obstinately called himself King Henry IX of Great Britain, France

and Ireland. On July 13th, 1807, the Cardinal Duke of York died peacefully in his episcopal palace at Frascati, whither he had been enabled to return on the conclusion of the peace between France and the Holy See, which the genius of Napoleon saw was essential to the restoration of France to her olden place amongst the nations of Christendom. At his interment in St. Peter's, the reigning Pontiff, Pius VII, and twenty-seven Cardinals were present and an immense concourse followed the remains of the last legitimate Catholic King of England through the streets of the Eternal City. Papal soldiery guarded the hearse and stood sentinel 'round the bier in the great church, while the cannon of St. Angelo's fired minute guns in mournful salutation of the last earthly triumphal passage of a truly noble prince and saintly priest.

WILLIAM F. DENNEHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

---

### A PARISH IN PICARDY.

SHOULD not have imagined that the following impressions were worth recording, had I not chanced on the following passage in Bodley's work on France. "A stranger's first ideas of a country are not to be despised, if only he will not parade them as a definite and weighty judgment. A new comer is often struck with characteristics which, apparent to this superficial view, soon evade the notice of the most observant student as the land and its people become familiar to him. A writer is wise, therefore, to note early impressions, as they indicate the points on which his countrymen need information."<sup>1</sup> Acting upon this suggestion I will set down, as faithfully as I may, the impressions which I received not many weeks ago when I visited France for the first time. What Catholic is there worthy of the name, who is not intensely interested in the struggle of the French Church for liberty, and who does not desire a closer acquaintance with the men engaged in the desperate encounter? I had followed closely the events which led up to the present crisis, and I had a growing desire to hear from their own lips what Catholics were saying and thinking in France itself. It occurred to me that a valuable sidelight might be thrown on the

---

<sup>1</sup> *France* by J. E. C. Bodley (new and revised edition, 1902, p. 16.

matter by settling down in some quiet spot far away from the haunts of politicians and the Chamber of Deputies. A provincial town, a priest's house seemed to me to be a vantage ground from which both priests and people might be studied, and so I decided to spend my holidays with a *vicaire*<sup>2</sup> in a certain town of Picardy.

It so happened that before I set out the Encyclical of Pius X had come like a bolt from the blue creating wonder and surprise in political circles. The English papers were loud in its praise or blame, and fearful for the safety of French clergy and their Churches. In a short space, according to some prophets, Catholics would be driven from their beautiful Cathedrals and old parish churches, public worship proscribed, and the faithful would be assisting at Mass in humble sheds if not hidden away in nooks and crannies. Here, then, were two all-sufficient reasons for seeing something of France without delay. First, it was high time to witness for oneself the faith or want of faith in parish, in town and country church before this terrible persecution should have changed the face of the land. Again, there could be no better opportunity for observing at close quarters how the people most concerned regarded the near prospect of Penal Laws and Penal Days.

It was a very hot day in September, the eve of the momentous meeting of the French Bishops in Paris, that I found my way to the quaint old town of X. As the train dragged its weary length along and finally deposited me at what seemed to me a make-shift station, I could not help thinking, 'they will be all excitement to get the latest news from Paris. During the next few weeks I shall hear nothing but talk of the Bishops, the law of Separation, the Anti-clericals, the Freemasons, etc.'

The house to which the good Abbe welcomed me had little of the Presbytery about it. It was simply one of a row of humble dwellings in the Rue Pasteur. Hard by at some little distance from the church lived the second *Vicaire*. Their chief (*M. le Doyen*) kept a third establishment under the walls of the parish church. My host proved to be the senior curate, and owing to the feebleness and ill-health of his parish priest, was practically in charge of the parish. He was young for this important position—not many years ordained—but his calmness and imperturbability dispelled all idea of the "new curate." Kind, courteous, thoroughly pious, with a keen sense of humour, he answered very well to the description one reads of the French *abbe*. It is not unkind to add that like the great mass of his fellow clergy he had no other experience of the world, than that

<sup>2</sup> It is hardly necessary, I suppose, to warn my readers that the terms *Vicaire* and *cure* correspond respectively to the English words *curate* and *parish priest*.



gained in his native village, his seminary, and his parish. But it is unjust to imply, as many writers have done, that men of this type are narrow in the objectionable sense of the word. Their horizon is not so limited as would appear, for they are almost to a man, students, and have as their hobby some intellectual question of the day. One will be interested in the results of the higher criticism, another will talk enthusiastically about Newman and the future of his philosophical system. In those parts I made the acquaintance of an abbe who has turned his inventive genius to account. After many years of labour and study he has manufactured out of honey a non-alcoholic liqueur which he calls "Melina." Many good judges have declared it equal to the famous Benedictine, and—surest test of approval—having formed themselves into a Company are building a large factory of which *M. l'abbe* is to be the Managing Director. He, at least, will be able to keep a roof over his Presbytery and Church. Would that other priests in France were as independent of government pensions also!

A *vicaire's* home is a model of frugality and unworldliness. Generally, it seemed, the priests could not afford to keep more than one servant—a demure housekeeper anywhere between the ages of fifty and seventy. My host was most fortunate. His old parents kept house for him, and a delightful couple they were. Good, pious, and simple country folk, their one earthly joy and consolation was their only son. They troubled little about the days of persecution ahead. They were calmly prepared for the worst and ready to suffer any privation with and for *M. le Vicaire*. Of the world they knew little and cared less. They had rarely left their native place before their son's ordination, then they had accompanied him to his first mission, and later migrated with him to X., his second charge. True, they had sometimes visited the great town of Amiens, but those were rare days, and furnished sufficient excitement for a decade of years. Their simplicity was charming because far removed from the world of telephone and motor-bus. Nothing gave them greater delight and amusement than to listen to a song in a strange and barbarous tongue. They had heard of the English long before I appeared. I have reason to hope I was not in their eyes the personification of everything English. For it was easy to discover that "the Englishman" had three characteristics and three only for them. "*Riche, pratiquant and mechant*" were epithets more than once applied. They were rich enough to afford a holiday on the Continent. They were practical too, for did they not provide themselves with all the necessities for such a perilous journey, and show themselves equal to all the emergencies of travel. It was hardly worth while to stoop to

disillusion, for my practice of taking notes daily confirmed this last impression. "*Voilà, pratiquant toujours!* (See, he is forever practical)" was their constant comment. But why "*mechant* (wicked)?" "*Ah!*" replied Madame, "*parce qu'ils ont tue La Pucelle,*" (because the English killed Joan of Arc). It was all to no purpose that I tried to shift the blame on to the French who had treacherously handed her over to the English. In vain I explained that the sin was committed a very long time ago and that since that time Englishmen had done their best to make amends. To her dying day the dear old soul will firmly believe we are still harbouring the murderers of Joan of Arc or their immediate descendants. Another instance of the same "*naivete*" was not without its lesson for me. Apropos of the sultry weather and the ennui occasioned by the least exertion, Monsieur fell to lamenting Father Adam's sin and its worldwide consequences. We were at one in blaming the folly of this mutual relation of ours, and in wishing he had never made the acquaintance of Mother Eve. So far, my orthodoxy was above suspicion. But when I volunteered the remark that even if Adam has behaved *comme il faut*, every one of us would in all probability have had his trial and his chance of Hell, at once I became a suspect. "*Voilà! ce n'est pas la meme religion*" (There! it is not the same religion), I heard Madame remark to her husband in an undertone. Is it surprising that all is sunshine to this happy couple and the gathering clouds pass unnoticed? As we sat round their humble board, one wondered what change the New Year would bring. Would it rudely disturb the heavenly peace and calm of hundreds of homes like this? Will poverty and want knock at the door of every Presbytery? Hitherto, their native frugality has enabled these priests to live in tolerable comfort. Their slender resources have forbidden them luxuries common to the middle-class. Their table is simply that of the working man. It is difficult to see how they can retrench without feeling the pinch of poverty.

I had read much about the decay of faith in France and its empty churches, and was anxious to see for myself if religion around X. was at the same low ebb. As far as one could discover Catholicity there enjoyed no particular advantages, yet it laboured under no special disadvantage. There was no colony of Jews in the town, and a Protestant was an unknown quantity. Perhaps it was well for X. Not fifty miles distant there was a Protestant Church and small congregation, and the *cure* whom I visited told me that one of his chief anxieties was the existence of this community in his parish. Defections of nominal Catholics to the Protestant Church were not infrequent but conversions to Catholicism unknown, possibly because

the *cure* was not as generous as the "*ministre*." X. has many claims to be considered a typical French town. Its population according to the official returns is four thousand, three hundred and sixty (4,360). All are nominally Catholics. There is a certain amount of diversity of employment. Roughly speaking, one half the population are factory hands earning their living in a shirt factory, a toy-factory, or a brewery. The other half is engaged in agricultural pursuits, chief among them being the cultivation of the beetroot in summer, and the manufacture of sugar in winter. The town is divided into two unequal parishes. Three thousand, six hundred souls are apportioned to the Mother Church, whose *cure* happens to be the Dean of that district. Another *cure*, singlehanded, had charge of the smaller church, in what was considered the poor quarter of the town. My curiosity did not allow me to rest satisfied with round figures and average number in the matter of church-going. I determined to make some statistics for myself, and contrived to count the numbers of those who heard Mass at the Mother Church the first Sunday after my arrival. Here are the figures as nearly as possible exact:

Mass 7, total 47, men 12; Mass 8, total 56, men 20; Mass 9.45 (Grand Messe) total 280,<sup>3</sup> men 43; Mass 11.20, total 98, men 27; Grand Total, 481, men 102.

In the afternoon, the congregation present at Vespers and Benediction numbered 49 and included 7 men.

On enquiry I was assured that this attendance was quite an average one. There was no particular reason why it should be considered in any way abnormal. At the other church, I found the percentage even worse. Out of a population of a thousand, not more than a hundred, all told, heard Mass on Sunday. The explanation vouchsafed was that they were nearly all poor, but it must be remembered there is nothing to be seen of the rags and nakedness of our slums among them. It is fairly accurate to say that in this town of four thousand, three hundred and sixty (4,360) not more than six hundred (600) usually fulfil their Sunday obligation. "Do they fulfil their Easter obligation any better?" I naturally asked. The answer was generally the same in neighbouring country missions as in the town. "Only those who are regular at Mass trouble to make their Easter duties." I was prepared to hear that the number would be greater, as with us many of the poor who are irregular at Mass never fail to approach the Sacraments once a year. If there was any qualification strangely enough it reduced the percentage of yearly communicants. Some priests complained that many (men

<sup>3</sup> This included about a hundred scholars in uniform.



principally), who always fulfilled their Sunday obligation, never fulfilled their Easter duties. The respectable citizen considers himself above that sort of thing and holds himself excused.

I had it on good authority that in a parish near Abbeville numbering one thousand, nine hundred Catholics, not more than ten men took the trouble to receive the Sacraments at Easter-time.

There was another noticeable feature of the sparse congregations, which could not fail to strike a stranger. The children (between six and sixteen) were fewer than the men. Apart from the hundred who attended High Mass in some distinctive uniform, I have no hesitation in saying (although I did not count them) that their numbers at the various Masses never equalled the figures I have given for the men, and sometimes fell far short. I do not lay undue stress on this feature because the school children were taking their holiday, a time when it is admittedly difficult to get them to Church. Still my friend woefully admitted that their attendance is very little better during term time. "What else can you expect?" he exclaimed, "when our elementary schools (*Ecoles communales*) are staffed by anti-clericals. They are not merely indifferent, but are afraid they will lose their situations, if they do not prove themselves anti-religious. It is only by dint of the most stringent regulations that the children can be prevailed upon to attend a full course of instruction for their first Confession and first Communion. "Is M. Bersot's remark true of X., I asked, that 'First Communion is the end of religion.'"<sup>4</sup> "No! it is not quite so bad as that, thank God, but it is safe to say that no more than a quarter of our children come to church once they have made their first Communion."

Since my return two leading questions have frequently been put to me, "are the priests in touch with the people? What is their forecast of the immediate future?" To neither query is a summary answer fair or sufficient. I will take the last first as it can be answered more simply.

Conversations with the priests not only of the town, but with very many in the neighborhood of X. revealed a difference of opinion. Some candidly expected the worst and were convinced that the government would not be satisfied until it had laid violent hands on the churches and the clergy. The more sanguine took a less gloomy view. The anti-clericals would persecute as far as they dared, but they would stop short of this sacrilege, not from any sentimental motive, but because, this violence would drive the people to open rebellion. This much I gathered by dint of frequent enquiries. Amongst themselves the crisis was seldom mentioned. If ever it was, the priests

---

<sup>4</sup> q. v. *La Separation et les Elections* par Jean Guiraud, p. 300.

unanimously agreed that nothing could be done until the Bishops had spoken, and to a man they showed they were ready to obey loyally the voice of authority. The usual topics of conversation seemed to be as domestic as any that agitate the minds of modern Utopians—the weather, the crops, the sick, and tidings of absent friends. To anticipate events, to prepare for eventualities, to educate public opinion is doubtless regarded as foolhardy, or even suicidal. A foreigner's strictures on this policy of *laissez-faire* might betoken insularity and narrowness of view. But strangers are not alone in thinking that more energetic measures should be taken in without delay. A distinguished contributor to *La Quinzaine* has ably put forward this view.<sup>5</sup> After making a study of Ireland, not from books or periodicals but by travelling its length and breadth, the abbe Tresal tells his fellow clergy that they have nothing to fear from the separation of Church and State. Catholicism is all the more vigorous in Ireland because of this separation and the same should obtain in France. Only the French priest must become 'a man of action and command,' for it is by virtue of these qualities that the Irish priest 'has solidly established his Church, and has succeeded preserving the faith midst the darkest days of persecution.'

What, then, are the actual relations between the priest and his flock? A little experience of mission-life warns one to be very careful in estimating the influence of the priest in his parish. It is a quality too subtle and evasive for a visitor to gauge with any degree of accuracy. Besides, he is sure to notice much that will fit in with preconceived notions, and in the present instance his bias is likely to be that the French priest has little or no influence with his people. Certainly, there is *prima facie* evidence for the charge. Our ordinary devices for keeping in touch with the congregation, and for keeping the young together—men's clubs, concerts, social gatherings and the like—did not exist around X. The priest only comes into personal contact with them when administering the Sacraments in Church or at the sick bed. At Church the convenience of the laity is not always studied. On Sundays and holidays of obligation there is indeed ample opportunity for hearing Mass. But one noted with regret the absence of all popular services during the week, *e. g.* Sodality devotions and congregational singing—which forms such an attraction elsewhere. To give our concrete example. The feast of Our Lady's Nativity is a day of some solemnity in Catholic countries. At X. there was a Missa Cantata at 9 A. M., and Vespers and Benediction, not in the evening but in the afternoon at

<sup>5</sup> *Enquete sur l'organisation d'une grande eglise separee de l'etat* par M l'abbe J. Tresal-La Quinzaine, December 1st, 1905. (Since published as a brochure.)

3.30 P. M. The result was what might have been expected when all the people were at work. The congregation numbered not more than twenty, (priests and servers included). The singing on this occasion, as on every other, was left entirely to the two paid Cantors. During Lent it is the custom for the priests to pay their one annual visit to all the houses in the Parish. As the anti-clerical party in X. formed the usual 60 per cent. of the population, I was curious to know what happened when the priest called on them. He was received kindly, I learned, and sat chatting with the master and mistress for some time. "On what topics—religion?" "Oh no! about the weather, the crops, and the state of trade." Apparently Sunday Mass and Easter duties are forbidden subjects. There is a tacit understanding that he does not remind them of these obligations. I asked myself, "Is a bad Catholic *more* or *less* likely to go to Church after this formal visit?" This timidity and fear of offending the worthless appears sometimes extreme. I did not object on principle to saluting everyone we met in the streets—man, woman, *and* child. Yet there were occasions when my inward soul rebelled. We constantly came across bands of young men returning home from work. The *abbe* invariably raised his hat and I followed suit, while they as often as not passed us by with a gibe and a sneer. "You will not salute those fellows again," I protested. "Yes, he said, we must make no distinction." Remonstrance was useless. It was the custom. But surely, politeness to this extent is taken for servility and weakness, whereas a little independence might beget some respect.

These and similar experiences made one wish that the French priests would break down the barriers that keep them a class apart—shut off from the people. While all the clergy admit that more intimacy is desirable, most declare it to be utterly impractical, and some even argue it would prove a scandal and a stumbling-block. The *abbe* Laude is one of the few who believes that the need for some change coincides with the opportunity. "Now or never," he says, "the French priest must leave the pious retreat of his Presbytery and sacristy and mix as much as possible with his flock—not with the good and fervent only but with the young and careless—above all with the men. He should get rid of the idea that he is in a Catholic country and adopt the ways and methods of a missionary in a heathen land. He must re-order his duties according to their vital importance:—1st, direct and frequent contact with the people in their homes; 2nd, Mass, sermons, instructions at the time, and after manner most likely to prove attractive: Lastly, the establishment of pious confraternities, altar societies, etc., which though excellent in their way are relatively unimportant."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *L'action ecclesiastique sous le regime de la separation*, q. v. *Revue du clerge francais*—August 15th, 1906.



My readers will gather that during my stay in France, I heard very little of the Law of Separation and the Freemasons. On the other hand I gained a clearer notion of the difficulties which hamper the movements of every French priest—the burden of rusty tradition weighing him down, the fetters of despotism binding him fast. And from this clearer knowledge springs a deeper sympathy. Trifling limitations cannot obscure their sterling qualities and their exemplary lives. To me they were the most delightful of companions. To the countryside they should be an incentive to virtue and a reproach to vice. It is a Protestant authority and not a Frenchman who declares that the French priest is still the “Salt of the Earth.” “The clergy represent all the best features of the French peasantry, who form the robust backbone of the nation; for it is to be noted that they are recruited exclusively from that class and from the minor bourgeoisie. The descendants of the nobility which monopolised the rich benefices of the old regime, who, in the intervals of their modern diversions, profess loud devotion to the Church successfully discourage their sons from entering orders of the secular clergy, now that it is ill-paid, laborious, and virtuous. The parish priests of France, than whom there is not a more exemplary body of men in any land, illustrate the better qualities, refined by discipline, of those great categories of the people which constitute the real force of the nation.”<sup>7</sup>

FRANCIS DE CAPITAIN.

Birmingham, England.

---

### INNOCENT III.

IN reading the chronicles of the Middle Ages there looms up as one of the most interesting personages the imposing figure of Innocent the Third, the most majestic and imperious of the Popes. His career has a particular interest in our day from the fact that he was the ideal Pope of Leo XIII. In the ancient church of St. John Lateran in Rome, over the door leading into the Sacristy, to the right of the choir, is the marble sarcophagus of Innocent III, beautifully severe, with a recumbent figure of the Pope, and ornamented with tracery of gold. This monument was erected by Leo XIII at his own cost, and after his own design; and over the corresponding door upon the opposite side will be placed Leo's permanent tomb.

---

<sup>7</sup> Bodley's France, p. 42.

Elevated to the pontificate in 1198, Innocent comes to us in the dawn of the wonderful Thirteenth Century, which because of its grand developments, of the political and spiritual progress made by the peoples of Europe, is one of the most memorable epochs in the history of the world. To this century we owe the growth of the great middle class, the freedom of cities, the admission of Commons into Legislatures, great universities, the Mendicant Friars, and the magnificent Gothic cathedrals which stud the cities of England, France and Spain—monuments to the fervent faith of the Middle Ages and to the creative power of the Catholic Church. Then also was formed that more wonderful structure, Scholastic Philosophy, the study of which is advocated by Leo XII at the close of the Nineteenth Century as the means of dissipating the false theories prevalent in modern society, the great Pontiff, in his Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, exhorting the clergy to restore the golden wisdom of St. Thomas.

In the conclave at which Lothair Conti was elected Pope under the style of Innocent III, there was witnessed in the historic city of Popes a scene which has been re-enacted many times since, and in our own day at the elevation of the illustrious patriarch of Venice—a man of ability, fully conscious of the power and awful responsibility of the office, shrinking from assuming what Dante calls “the mighty mantle of the Papacy.”

Innocent was sprung from the noble Italian house of Conti, and numbered amongst his relatives some of the foremost ecclesiastics of Rome. In the region of Monti in the city of Rome can still be seen the high walls of the Tor de Conti, the ruins of the greatest mediaeval fortresses built within the city, and which was the stronghold of the family to which Innocent belonged.

He was educated in theology at the great university of Paris, and in law at the University of Bologna; he was made Cardinal at the age of twenty-nine years, during the pontificate of his uncle, Clement III, and became one of the ablest advisers of that Pope. But he was now only thirty-seven years of age; he knelt at the feet of the Cardinals, who were unanimous in his nomination, and prayed that the burden be not placed on his shoulders. His election was received with general applause, though a contemporary German poet, Walter von der Vogelweide cries out:

“Woe to us, we have a stripling for a Pope;  
O Lord, have mercy on Christendom.”

But it soon became apparent to the world that a great man was seated in the chair of St. Peter.

Of unsullied purity of character and gifted with lofty ideas, none of his predecessors surpassed him in grandeur of intellect. He has been called the Augustus of the Papacy, the claims of supremacy developed by circumstances and by the vote of Christendom, formulated a hundred years before by Gregory VII, and bravely contended for by that Saint and by Alexander III, Innocent exercised in their plenitude to the day of his death. His ecclesiastical supremacy was undisputed, and as the representative of Christ on earth he was regarded by the world as superior to every temporal power. He was the supreme arbiter between kings and between peoples and their rulers. He deposed kings, at his word great armies were set in motion, and his command sufficed to arrest the army of Philip Augustus when that monarch was about to wrest the crown from the most worthless of the Plantagenets. He organized a system vaster than that of the Roman Empire, the kings of the world did him homage, his cardinals and legates traversed the length and breadth of Christendom publishing his decrees, settling the differences among churches and monasteries, interfering in behalf of the oppressed, compelling rulers to obey the moral law, and laying interdicts on kingdoms. The aims of Innocent during his pontificate were: To reform the Church by raising the standard of its ministers in holiness and dignity, and by securing their independence from temporal power—to make the influence of the Pope as head of the Church felt throughout Christendom, that the nations should acknowledge that in him resided the principle of spiritual supremacy, that as God's representative on earth he was superior to every temporal authority—added to these was his ardent desire to rescue Palestine from the hands of the infidels.

## II.

On his accession to the throne Italy was in a state of chaos, the fairest parts of the land were in possession of German adventurers holding under authority of the German Empire, the throne of which was now vacant, no successor to the tyrannical Henry VI, who had died in 1197, having been yet elected.

Innocent's first thought was to deliver the city of Rome from alien rule. Winning to himself the hearts of the people of Rome by his benevolence and generosity, he compelled the prefect, who had been nominated by the Emperor, to swear allegiance to himself. He re-established the office of senator, named the senator himself, charged to represent the interests of the people of



Rome, and taking the oath of fidelity to the Pope and the Roman Church. Supreme in his own city, Innocent proceeded to drive the vassals of the German Empire from the patrimony of St. Peter.

The most formidable of them, the Seneschal Markwald, was in possession of the Marches of Ancona and of the Romagna. Refusing to restore these possessions to the Roman Church at the demand of Innocent, an excommunication was hurled against him, he was by a Papal army driven from the territory held by him, into the south of Italy. The other adventurers were successively forced to withdraw; the cities of the Duchy of Tuscany, which had been a century before during the life of Gregory VII, bequeathed by the Countess Matilda to the Holy See, expelled their German governors. Of these cities Innocent formed a league under the Papal authority, providing for their freedom, and the protection of the Church. Thus within one year from his elevation to the throne he regained the possessions taken from the Church by Henry VI, asserted his rights as an Italian prince, and was the dominant power in Italy.

The Emperor Henry VI had left surviving him his widow Constance and his little son Frederick, five years of age, rightful heir to the throne of Sicily and Naples. To strengthen his position against troublesome factions Constance requested of Innocent the investiture of the realm for her son, as the kingdom was recognized as a fief of the Holy See. Innocent consented, but keeping in view his purpose of freeing the Church from all secular influence, insisted on the surrender of certain privileges wrung from Adrian IV. These included the right of the king to appoint bishops. Constance consented, these prerogatives, the Four Chapters, were annulled, and the solemn investiture granted. Queen Constance, before her death, which took place shortly afterwards, appointed Innocent as guardian of her son, and for nine years he acted as regent of the kingdom defending the interests of his ward against internal factions and the attacks of Markwald and other adventurers who plotted the ruin of the young King, and when his ward attained his majority Innocent turned over to him his inheritance in a flourishing condition. Dollinger, in his Church History, bears testimony to the fidelity with which he carried out his trust, and Emerton says: "In spite of the traditional enmity of the Papacy to the house of Hohenstaufen, the great Pope seems to have carried out his trust in entire good faith."

## III.

Before the death of the Emperor, Henry VII, he proclaimed his son, Frederic II, King of the Romans and heir to the German Empire, but the empire was an elective one, and an infant emperor was contrary to German usage and unsuited to the troublous times. An election was necessary and at once there revived the fierce feud between the two great factions which divided Europe—the Guelphs and the Ghibbelines.

The Guelphs elected as Emperor Otho, duke of Aquitaine, nephew of Richard Coeur de Lion of England; the Ghibbelines elected Philip of Suabia, the uncle of the young Frederic. Each was solemnly crowned, the former at Aix la Chapelle, the latter at Mentz, and war between the claimants at once broke out. Both parties submitted their claims to the Pope for investigation, a recognition of the supreme authority with which the public law at that time clothed the sovereign Pontiff.

After some delay Innocent in 1201 declared in favor of Otho. This interposition, as they termed it, of Innocent in the affairs of Germany, has been condemned by many English and German historians hostile to the Papacy. Says John Henry Milman: "Ten years of strife and civil war in Germany are to be traced, if not to the direct institution, to the inflexible obstinacy of Pope Innocent III."

But the contention is manifestly unfair, his act was not an inter-meddling, both claimants appealed to him. His Protestant biographer, Hurter, says: "By intervening in the election of the German Emperor Innocent III did not encroach upon the rights of the empire to the profit of the Holy See, he simply complied with the expressed wish of all Europe which stood in expectation of his decision." In making his decision Innocent was apparently governed by an earnest desire to safeguard the interests of the empire and of the Church. As Bryce says, the empire was essentially an elective one; the object of this policy was the selection of the fittest man. To confirm the election of Philip would be to place a fourth Emperor of the house of Hohenstaufen upon the German throne, to virtually declare the office hereditary in one family.

The members of the house of Hohenstaufen, and the Ghibbeline party of which it was the head, had shown themselves at all times the implacable enemies of the Papacy, while the Guelphs were the supporters of the Popes and of the Free Cities. Milman acknowledges that in Italy at least, the cause of the Guelphs was

more than that of the Church, it was the cause of freedom and humanity.

Philip himself was under the ban of excommunication for assisting his brother, Henry VI, in usurping Church property.

Innocent believed that it was not for the best interest of Europe that the crown of the Holy Roman Empire, the first of all crowns, to which was attached the duty of protecting Christianity, should, contrary to the spirit of its institution, become the patrimony of a family whose princes were notorious for their hostility to the Church, and their cruelty to their subjects.

But as the war progressed the majority of the German princes inclined to the side of Philip, and Innocent had made preparations to reverse his decision and declare him Emperor, when in 1208 Philip was murdered by a nobleman to whom he had given personal affront. Dissension in Germany now ceased, the diet at Frankfort recognized Otho as Emperor, and he was crowned by the Pope in the basilica of St. Peter's with great splendor.

Before his coronation Otho solemnly promised to grant freedom of ecclesiastical elections and to respect the rights of the Church. But when secure on his throne he seized upon the Papal territory in Tuscany, and invaded the possessions of the young King of Sicily. He miscalculated the power of the Pope, whose services he had repaid with ingratitude, and whose authority he defied. Innocent pronounced against him the sentence of excommunication, his adherents fell away from him as if he had been stricken with the plague, and at the diet of princes at Nuremberg Innocent declared as Emperor the young Frederic II, who had now reached his majority.

#### IV.

One of the most important problems which confronted Innocent upon his accession to the throne was the settlement of the marriage relations of Philip Augustus, King of France. On the death of his wife, Isabella of Hainault, Philip had espoused Engelburga, sister of the King of Denmark described by historians as an attractive and virtuous princess distinguished by her long bright hair. But immediately after his marriage Philip showed an uncontrollable aversion to his young wife and determined to rid himself of her. Obsequious bishops were easily found to declare the marriage invalid because of affinity based on alleged relationship. Engelburga was confined in the convent of Beaurepaire, and Philip wedded Agnes the beautiful daughter of the Duke of Meran. Engelburga, defenseless in a foreign land, appealed to



the Church of Rome, which has ever been the champion of the inviolability of the marriage tie, and which never rendered a better service to humanity than when in the turbulent Middle Ages it asserted the sacredness of the domestic relations against the violent passions of the young, untamed people of Europe.

Ingelburga's appeal reached Rome in the last years of Pope Celestine III, and the aged pontiff bequeathed its settlement to his successor.

One of Innocent's first acts as Pope was to warn Philip through the bishop of Paris of the sin he was committing, and to exhort him to take back his lawful wife. But this warning Philip treated with cool indifference. Pope Celestine had hesitated to bring about an open rupture with the King of France, and it was even more to the interest of Innocent to maintain peace. Philip Augustus was the ablest, the most ambitious, and the craftiest monarch of his age. It was important to Innocent to have his good will in the dispute between the Papacy and the empire, and his aid was indispensable in the Crusade, the enterprise which was so dear to Innocent's heart.

But when Innocent determined on a course of action which he believed was his duty, he ever pursued it with single-heartedness and indivertibility of purpose. He sent to France as his legate the Cardinal Peter of Capua, commissioning him to compel the King of France to receive his discarded wife, and in case of the King's refusal, to subject the realm of France to an interdict, suspending all the divine offices of the Church except the baptism of infants and the absolution of the dying.

This dreadful form of punishment seems strange in our day, as the innocent suffered with the guilty, but it did not seem strange in the Middle Ages, when under the feudal law the King and his subjects were brought into such close relationship and reciprocal responsibility that their interests were regarded as identical. It grew into frequent use in the Eleventh Century, and because of resentment it caused amongst the people against their offending rulers, it became an efficacious weapon in the hands of the clergy against the aggressions of Kings and nobles. Philip remaining obdurate, the interdict was published. Darras gives a graphic account of its proclamation, from which one can form an idea of its solemnity and importance. "On the 12th of December, 1199, at midnight, the mournful tolling of the cathedral bells summoned the Fathers of the Council of Dijon. The bishops and priests repaired in silence to the Basilica, lighted on their way by flaming torches. The image of the Crucified was covered with a black veil. The sacred relics had been removed

to the crypts; the last remains of the consecrated hosts had been burned. The legate wearing a violet stole, as on the day that commemorates the Saviour's passion, pronounced the ecclesiastical interdict "upon all the provinces subject to the rule of the King of France, so long as that prince refused to break off his adulterous commerce with Agnes of Merania."

"At these words all the torches were thrown to the ground and extinguished, adding the horror of deep darkness to the awe inspired by the impressive ceremony itself; the arches of the Cathedral resounded with the mingled groans and sobs of women, children and old men. 'The last great day,' says a contemporary writer, 'seemed at hand.'

"The execution of the interdict threw a veil of mourning over the whole of France; all was consternation, and the writers of the day describe the general grief in the most pathetic terms. Numbers of the faithful thronged to Normandy and other territories of the English King solely to enjoy the consolation of religion."

For nine months Philip resisted all appeals, but his people becoming mutinous and his barons rising in rebellion he sent envoys to Rome to intercede for him with the Pope, but it was his misfortune to have come into conflict with one of the most inflexible of men. To the threats and entreaties of Philip's envoys Innocent answered: "He knows our decree; let him put away his concubine, receive his lawful wife, reinstate the bishops whom he has expelled, and we will raise the interdict, and examine into the case." "I will turn Mohammedan," cried Philip, "happy Saladin, he has no Pope above him."

The King at last yielded, the interdict was lifted, and six months afterward Philip recognized Ingelburga as his lawful wife, although he never gave her his love, and the Pope legitimized the children of Agnes of Meran.

## V.

The extraordinary powers claimed by the Papacy in those days were fully exercised in the conflict between Innocent and King John of England. The quarrel arose on the filling of the vacant see of Canterbury. Upon the death of Archbishop Hubert in 1205, the monks of Christ Church, according to ancient usage, claimed the right to elect his successor; the junior monks without license immediately elected as archbishop their superior, Reginald. But King John had determined to place in the see of Canterbury John de Gray, a man entirely devoted to his inter-

ests. He ordered the monks to proceed to a new election, and by his direction his favorite was elected as Archbishop. Both claimants appealed to Rome, and sent embassies to represent them before the Curia; King John sending to the Pope a messenger offering him three thousand marks if he would decide in favor of John de Gray. Innocent set aside both elections for irregularity and ordered the monks of Canterbury present in Rome from both sides, to meet together and select a new archbishop, recommending to their choice an eminent Englishman, Stephen Langton, then residing in Rome. Langton was one of the most learned men of his day, had been rector of the University of Paris, and was cardinal of the Roman Church. He will be ever remembered as the patriot under whose leadership the barons secured from King John the Magna Charta. He was duly elected Archbishop of Canterbury, and Innocent himself consecrated him at Viterbo. This news infuriated John. He wreaked his first vengeance on the monks of Christ Church, driving them into exile and seizing their possessions, and he prohibited Langton from setting foot in England.

Thereupon Innocent placed the entire kingdom under an interdict; this proving of no avail, was followed in two years by a bull of excommunication against the person of the King, cutting him off as a withered branch from the Church.

The King still remained defiant in spite of the mutinous condition of his kingdom and the disaffection of his barons. He sought alliances on all sides, and even solicited the aid of Mohammed al Nasser, agreeing to embrace the Mohammedan faith.

Finally in 1212 Innocent solemnly pronounced the deposition of John as King of England, absolving his subjects from their allegiance to him, and calling on all Christian Kings and nobles to carry out the sentence. Philip Augustus of France was nothing loth to take this opportunity of adding to his realm the possessions of his ancient enemy and gathered together a formidable army for that purpose.

But John, feeling his crown slipping from him, gave up the contest. He had defied the power of the Roman Pontiff for a much longer time than had Philip; his humiliation was deeper. He agreed to admit Archbishop Langton to his see, to recall all exiles, liberate from prison all adherents to the Pope, and to compensate the clergy for their losses.

He solemnly resigned into the hands of the Papal legate, Pandulph, his kingdoms of England and Ireland, reserving to himself and his heirs the administration of justice and all the rights of



the crown, taking the usual oath of fealty to the Pope. He received back his kingdoms to be thereafter held in fee of the Bishop of Rome by the annual rent of one thousand marks; this annual tribute amounting in modern money to about sixty-four thousand dollars, was paid by the Kings of England with some irregularity until the seventeenth year of the reign of Edward I.

Because of this transaction the memory of King John has been consigned by English writers to eternal infamy. But without defending it, we should consider that John preserved the throne and secured a powerful protector; that it was no uncommon thing in those days for sovereigns to do homage to other rulers for parts of their possessions. And this cession was granted with the advice of the great council of his barons, and it had an important bearing on the securing of the Magna Charta, for, as Dr. Lingard says, "To the barons it offered a protector to whom as superior lord they might appeal from the despotic government of his vassal. From that moment they began to demand the grant of their liberties. On his refusal they appealed by their agents to the gratitude of the Pontiff, reminding him that 'it was not to the good will of the King, but to them and the compulsion which they had employed, that he was indebted for his superiority over the English Crown.'"

Some writers condemn Innocent because in the subsequent conflict between the King and the barons over the great charter of liberties he espoused the cause of the King. He annulled the charter because it had been obtained by violence. But this conduct is consistent with Innocent's character; he was a strict interpreter of the duties and limitations of his office under the feudal law. England had become a fief of the Holy See, and he could not countenance an open rebellion against his vassal. But he promised the barons, if they would properly lay their complaints before him at Rome, that all grievances would be abolished, that the Crown should be content with its just rights, and the people should enjoy their ancient liberties.

In like manner the same writers charge that while Innocent punished Philip Augustus for a breach of the matrimonial laws, he ignored the cases of the King of England and King Pedro of Arragon. But it is admitted that in these cases there was no appeal to Rome. Innocent never cited a case before the Holy See except upon formal complaint made or upon an appeal to his decision made by either party to the controversy, and when an appeal was made he never failed to mete out exact justice irrespective of the rank or condition of the parties.

## VI.

One of the cherished objects of Innocent's ambition, and the only one which he failed to attain, was the rescuing of Palestine from the rule of the Mohammedan. But the results of the great expedition he inspired were so momentous as to render it a memorable event in the history of the world.

Of all the territory in Palestine won by former crusades, only Antioch and a few minor towns remained in the hands of the Christians. The sad condition of the holy places was the burden of letters written by Innocent throughout his pontificate to the clergy, the princes, and the people of Europe. His eloquent appeals first brought fruit in the hearts of the chivalrous noblemen of France. Fulk of Neuilly was the preacher of the fourth crusade, and soon an imposing army headed by the foremost soldiers of France, Flanders, Italy and Germany were arrayed under the standard of the cross.

The dangers and difficulties of the land journey had been shown by the former expeditions to Syria, and it was determined to proceed by sea. But who were to furnish the means of transportation. All eyes were instinctively turned to the Republic of Venice, to the descendants of "the hardy men who fleeing from the wrath of Attila had sought a shelter in the islands of the Adriatic Gulf," and who had there built up a commonwealth which because of its maritime situation had grown to commercial greatness during the first crusades. The Venetians engaged to transport the entire army and provision the fleet for nine months for the sum of 85,000 silver marks, but this amount the crusaders were unable to pay, although some of the leaders sacrificed their plate in an endeavor to make up the amount. Then the Doge, ambitious for the glory of the republic, proposed to waive the deficiency if the crusaders would first lend their aid in the conquest of the city of Zara, lately taken from the Venetians by the King of Hungary.

This proposition to turn their arms against a Christian city caused disapproval and dissension in the ranks of the crusaders, but time pressed, and necessity seemed to indicate the action proposed. The treaty was signed, the aged Henry Dandolo, Doge of Venice, blind, but of remarkable energy and ability, took the cross and joined the expedition at the head of fifty galleys, and on the 8th of October, 1202, the imposing array of four hundred and eighty ships in all moved down the Adriatic.

The city of Zara was soon reduced, but here another diversion took place. Isaac Angelus, Emperor of Constantinople, had been

deposed by his brother Alexius, imprisoned and deprived of his eyesight, and his son, Alexius Comnenus, was a suppliant in the camp of the crusaders, praying their help to replace his father on the throne. He promised in return that he would end the schism which had so long separated the Greek and Roman Churches, that he would furnish the crusaders with money and provisions, and add ten thousand soldiers to their ranks. Relying on these promises and dazzled by the prospects of adventure and gain which such an enterprise held out, and believing that the conquest of Constantinople was a step towards the recovery of Jerusalem, the crusaders espoused the cause of the blind emperor and turned their prowess toward the Hellespont.

Against these two diversions Innocent protested, appealed, and threatened, and he finally excommunicated the Venetians who had been the instigators of these collateral expeditions. It was on the 23rd of June, 1203, that the fleet of the crusaders appeared before the great capital of the East, whose massive walls enclosed over a million people. But they were an effeminate race, enervated by luxury and dissipation and soon yielded to the impetuous assaults of the Western knights, Isaac and Alexius were restored to the throne, soon to be displaced by another usurper; then came the second storming of the city by the crusaders, and Constantinople, with its palaces and churches rich with the accumulated wealth of centuries was treated as the lawful prize of the conquerors. Baldwin, Count of Flanders, was proclaimed Emperor, the reunion of the Greek and Roman Churches was solemnly proclaimed in the Church of St. Sophia, Innocent assumed the full ecclesiastical administration of the East, and nominated the patriarch of Constantinople. But the Latin Emperors of the East and the reunion of the church lasted for little more than half a century; the strength of the crusading army was spent in defense of the empire of Baldwin and his successors.

Venice was the chief gainer by the expedition; her commercial primacy was secured. Many treasures and relics of the Saints found in the churches of Constantinople were distributed among the cities of Europe. In Venice the horses of Lysippus over the main portal of St. Mark's are memorials of the romantic ending of the Fourth Crusade.

## VII.

It may be easily supposed that a pontiff so enterprising and vigilant as was Innocent, summoning the hosts of Europe to battle with the infidels on the wastes of Syria, would not look with



indifference on the increasing growth of dangerous heresies which had spread over some of the fairest parts of Europe.

History has given to these sects whose origin can be traced back to the Gnosticism and Manichaeism of the East, the general name of Albigenses; they were also known as Cathari, and included the Paterines and Paulicians. Differing from each other in many things, these sects were united in their anti-clericalism, manifesting a fierce hostility to whatever was connected with the Church. The most advanced of these sectaries held that the evil spirit created all visible things, and denied the fundamental teachings of Christianity. While some taught that matrimony was an alliance whose author was the evil spirit, others found authority for unbridled sensual indulgence.

In Languedoc a license of manners had grown up adverse to Christian morals. Much of the teachings of these sects was subversive not only of the religious, but also of the social relations; vandalism was rampant amongst them, churches were burned and holy things profaned. They were to be found in many of the cities of upper Italy, but were most numerous in the sunny regions of the south of France, and especially in Languedoc, where they were under the open protection of Raymond VI, Count of Toulouse. Innocent endeavored at first by gentle means to bring back the unbelievers into the church. In the first year of his pontificate he issued to them letters and mandates; he sent among them able preachers to exhort and to discuss controverted points. The first sent were Rainer and Guido, two Cistercian monks; then followed the Bishop of Osma in Spain, and the sub-prior of his cathedral, Dominic, afterwards known to the world as the great founder of the Dominican order. These two men traversed Languedoc barefoot and in the poor garb of Apostles. They were followed by the Papal legates, Peter of Castelnan and Raoul.

For eighteen years this missionary work went on with but little success and was finally terminated by the assassination of the legate, Peter of Castelnan. His murder caused a sensation in Europe similar to that of the murder of Becket at Canterbury. Count Raymond of Toulouse was strongly suspected of having instigated the deed, and the murderers were received into his court after their guilt was known. Innocent now felt constrained to resort to force; he proclaimed a crusade against the heretics, excommunicated Raymond and absolved his subjects from their allegiance.

The army that answered the call of the Pope was chiefly from

France, the ranks of those who entered the crusade for love of religion were swelled by the addition of adventurers inspired by the baser motives of ambition and desire for spoils. The celebrated Simon of Montford was leader of the campaign and the war that ensued was one of pitiless cruelty and ended in the complete overthrow of the heretics.

At this day no one will defend the use of force in securing religious uniformity, but in considering the Albigensian crusade we should look at it, not from the viewpoint of today, but from that of the Middle Ages. Creighton in his work on the Papacy, states the proposition fairly thus:

"Others again had absorbed Manichæan heresies and vague Oriental mysticism, while others used these sects for Antinomian views, for religious heedlessness and profligacy of life. Looked at from the point of view of our own day, they seem a strange mixture of good and evil; but from the point of view of the Middle Ages they could only be regarded with horror. They destroyed the unity of the church, Christianity became in men's eyes a mockery. It was in vain to hope for God's blessing on their arms against the infidels in the Holy Land if they allowed unbelievers within the pale of Christendom to rend asunder Christ's seamless robe."

And that this is the proper way to study the history of the past is tersely stated by Professor Ewing as follows:

"How often is there not forgotten that truth—that the sentiments and ideas of men change with the ages. It is lamentable that partisans will read into the story of the past the ideals of today, and so mar the true history of men's acts."

The personal bearing of Innocent in this crusade is not inconsistent with the general character for mildness which history has given him. Several times during the war he interposed in favor of Count Raymond and his son. The excesses which were committed caused him great grief.

"Although great excesses may have been committed in the south of France against humanity and justice, and although the forces sent thither to re-establish the authority and faith of the Church carried on instead, a war of indiscriminate rapine, still Innocent cannot be held responsible for either. His orders were not carried out, and he was led by false reports to take measures which he never would have taken had he known the true state of affairs." (Hurter.)

The history of the different nations at this period is filled with the deeds of Innocent and show how complete was the suprem-

acy he exercised, and how widespread his sovereignty. We see him arranging a peace between the Kings of Portugal and Castile, compelling Alphonse IX, King of Leon, to break off the marriage he had contracted with his niece, summoning to Rome Pedro II of Arragon, to whom he gave the Crown in payment of the promised annual tribute to the Holy See. In Hungary he is acting as arbitrator between the two claimants for the crown, Emmeric and Andrew, receiving the submission of the Prince of Dalmatia, and crowning the Duke of Bohemia. He extends his authority over Servia and Armenia; and the mission of his legate to Iceland, and his letters to the bishops there, are evidence that even that remote region was not outside his watchful care.

#### VIII.

The foundation of the two great orders of Mendicant Friars—the Dominicans and Franciscans, has been called the crowning religious event in the pontificate of Innocent.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century the Church had reached a critical point in its history. The age was a turbulent one, society was passing through a transformation; it was necessary that the Church should adapt itself to the changing conditions, and the parochial organization of the clergy was not adequate to the wants of the growing population of towns and cities.

Through the devotion of the people and the gratitude of princes the Church had grown rich, and wealth had brought about a laxity of discipline. Under the feudal system the bishops were temporal lords, and much of their time was spent in executive duties foreign to their sacred office. By means of the administration of the splendid ritual of the Church the priests did indeed keep alive the faith of the people, but much of the preaching was of a perfunctory character.

The monks were the exemplars of the age, their monasteries were the schools, the universities, of the people. But although they were the favorite preachers, appeared before kings and princes, and were called from their cloisters to settle important disputes, the monks were by the rules of their orders secluded from the world, inhibited from mingling with the people, and thereby prevented in a great measure from counteracting the dangerous influence of the heretics. Heresiarchs had arisen on all sides and many of them by their abstemious life and poverty illustrated the severe asceticism which they taught. They became popular preachers, and in public places charged the clergy



with immorality and denounced their wealth and indolence.

To preserve the Church from the dangers which menaced it, two men successively offered their services to Innocent. Macaulay says that the Catholic Church "Thoroughly understands what no other church has ever understood—how to deal with enthusiasts;" and the wisdom and foresight of Pope Innocent was never more fully shown than when he sanctioned the projects of Francis of Assisi, and Dominic of Castile, for reforming the Christian world.

St. Francis, of whom Tennyson sings, "Sweet St. Francis of Assisi, would that he were here again," was but twenty-eight years of age when he appeared before Innocent whilst the pontiff was walking in the garden of the Lateran. Seeing that riches and pride were driving the love of God from the hearts of men, that wars brought on by the ambition of princes were grinding and crushing God's poor, he had four years before taken up the work of an Apostle. He had literally followed the precept of the Gospel, had given up his kindred and his worldly possessions; his enthusiasm had attracted to him a band of eleven young men.

Now, emaciated, bareheaded, barefooted and half clad, he asked the great Pope that he be commissioned to organize a body of men who would endeavor to convert the world by bringing it back to the evangelical ways of poverty and charity.

Although canons had been adopted limiting the number of religious houses to those already in existence, the Pope felt that in the case of St. Francis he was called to recognize one who had a divine vocation, and he sent him on his mission with his approval and blessing.

Of all the men whose names are inscribed on the list of the sanctified, there is none that is dearer than St. Francis. Others might adore the omnipotence and justice of God, and fear his punishments, but it was the divine attribute of goodness which enraptured the soul of St. Francis. Loving God in his goodness with a mystical fervor, his love extended to all created things as God's creatures. He surpassed the pantheists in his love for nature, the birds and beasts were his brothers, and when his emaciated body was stretched on his pallet in his last sickness, he welcomed "Sister Death." He placed little value in learning, in homely language he preached the words of Christ, the love of God. The zeal and sanctity of St. Francis soon increased the number of his followers; into them he infused his own contempt for riches; he enjoined upon them absolute poverty; they were

for riches; he enjoined upon them absolute poverty; they were to live upon the alms they would receive. Two by two, clothed in garments not differing from those of beggars, he sent them to the poor and the outcast, to comfort the suffering, to nurse the sick, the lepers, and to reclaim the sinful from the error of their ways. Wherever there was suffering and sin, there was the mission of the begging brothers, the mendicant friars. The success of the undertaking of St. Francis was immediate, the order sprang at once into importance and soon extended into all parts of the civilized world. At the second Chapter held in 1219, ten years after its foundation, 5,000 friars attended, and in forty years more it numbered 8,000 convents and nearly 200,000 members. Our ideals have not advanced beyond those of our forefathers of the thirteenth century; the call of St. Francis to a purer and simpler life created a spiritual revolution throughout Europe. It was a time when thousands left home and country, crossed seas and deserts, and sacrificed their lives under the burning sun of Syria to rescue from destruction the soil sanctified by the feet of our Saviour during his mission on earth. Today our ideas are limited by a gross materialism, the lust of gain and the desire for place are excluding from our minds fraternal charity, the ideals of truth, justice and goodness. We need another St. Francis to lead us back to first principles, to convince us of the truth that in all that we possess we are but the trustees of God; that to be rich in this world's possessions, whilst our brothers are in misery and want, to live thus and to die thus, and yet escape the condemnation of God, is a moral impossibility.

In a magnificent tomb in the City of Bologna lie the mortal remains of St. Dominic, whom the Catholic Church honors as one of the greatest of her champions. Dominic was a noble Castilian who, while yet a young priest accompanying his patron, the Bishop of Osma, to Languedoc, found himself in the midst of the Albigensian heresies, and realized the danger that menaced the Church from within. Meeting the Papal legates who were sent to convert the heretics, he rebuked them for the pomp and magnificence in which they traveled through the country, and advised them to dismiss their splendid retinue, and in apostolic simplicity and humility, and with earnest preaching endeavor to reclaim those who had wandered from the right path. He set the example himself and for ten years traveled through the country on foot, preaching to the heretics, accomplishing the only successful missionary work done in Languedoc. Some writers assert that he took part in the crusade which followed, but mod-

ern research has shown that these statements are without foundation. Lea acquits him of the charge, stating that Dominic's project looked only to the peaceful conversion of the heretics and to performing the duties of instruction and exhortation; that the accounts we have of him show him to be kindly in heart and of winning disposition, and that all the miracles related of him are beneficent ones.

The only weapons he used were a persuasive eloquence, a passionate devotion for the spread of the Catholic faith, and a firm belief in the intercession of the Mother of God, in whose honor he instituted the beautiful exercise of the Rosary, which has since entered into the devotional life of every Catholic.

During his stay in Languedoc Dominic had founded at Prouille a community of sixteen men to assist him in his work, and in 1215 he obtained from Innocent authority to found a new order under the rule of St. Augustine. The evils he desired to combat were ignorance and prejudice, and his aim was to form a band of practical missionaries, competent to teach.

According to his rule as fully developed his followers were required to take the vow of poverty so that they might be able to devote their entire energies to their work.

The success of the Dominicans, or Friars Preachers, as they came to be called, was marvelous, and rivalled that of the Franciscans. At the holding of the second Chapter of the Order in 1221, the year of Dominic's death, the brotherhood which had begun with sixteen disciples, numbered sixty convents, and had spread all over Europe. Although the two orders at first differed in their aim, they were similar in their organization, and in time they exercised a reciprocal influence on each other; the Franciscans realized that learning is not inconsistent with Godliness and the Dominicans followed the lead of their rivals in adopting the vow of poverty. They formed communities of women known respectively as the Poor Sisterhood of St. Clare, and the Dominican nuns. And to comply with the demands of the multitudes who pressed for admission into their ranks, and to further identify themselves with the people, they founded orders for lay people, called the "Tertiaries," whereby men and women without abandoning their social duties could become assimilated to the Friars and live according to their teachings. Thus the influence of the Friars permeated all classes of society, and it is no wonder that, as Brice says, "they were all-pervading, all-powerful." They formed two great armies of volunteers ready to do service for the Church, and always at the command of the Pope. Their



advent caused a great moral reformation and brought the Church again in touch with the people. Pulpit oratory revived, the tide of heresy was rolled back. "Francis made a new ideal to shine out before his contemporaries, an ideal before which all these fantastic sects vanished as birds of night take flight at the first rays of the sun." (Paul Sabatier.)

An intellectual awakening followed, Italian poetry had its beginning, architecture received a new inspiration. From the ranks of the Friars rose popes, cardinals, and bishops; and in their schools were found the greatest theologians of the age — Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon and Duns Scotus.

These two great men, St. Francis and St. Dominic worked out their theories independently of each other, yet history has always linked their names together; their memory is enshrined in the verse of Dante—

"The one was all seraphic in ardor;  
The other by his wisdom upon earth,  
A splendor was of light cherubical."

Warned by his failing health that he had not much longer to live, Innocent in 1213 determined to carry out the plans which he had long conceived, of crowning the great achievements which he wrought for the Church by convoking a General Council. It met on the day appointed, November 1st, 1215, in the venerable Basilica of St. John Lateran, in the palace of which Innocent had fixed his home, at the beginning of his pontificate. This Council, known as the Fourth of the Lateran, or the Twelfth General Council, was the largest and most imposing assemblage of the universal Church which the world had yet seen. There were present seventy-one primates and archbishops, four hundred and twelve bishops and eight hundred abbots and priors. The patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople came in person and those of Alexandria and Antioch sent their representatives. There were also in attendance ambassadors and representatives of every prince in Christendom; counting the ecclesiastics, representatives of princes, theologians, notaries, etc., there were in attendance 2,283 persons. It was a parliament of the world. "It is a weighty illustration of the service which the Church has rendered in counteracting the centrifugal tendencies of the nations that such a federative council of Christendom, attainable in no other way, was brought together at the summons of the Roman Pontiff. Without some such cohesive power, modern civilization would have worn a very different aspect."—(Lea.)

Innocent opened the Council with an eloquent sermon beginning with the words of Christ, "With desire, I have desired to eat this Pasch with you before I suffer."

One of the principal objects of the Council was to organize a new crusade. It was ordered for the ensuing year and all preparations were made therefor. One of the first acts of the Council was to condemn the errors of the Albigenses. Against their principle—that there are two Supreme Principles, one of good and the other of evil, the Council declared that there is but one God, one Principle, one Creator of all things, visible and invisible.

Against the attack made upon the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, the Council in enunciating the doctrine always held by the Catholic Church, used for the first time the word now become famous—Transubstantiation—declaring that "The body and Blood of Jesus Christ are truly contained in the Sacrament of the Altar under species of bread and wine, the bread being Transubstantiated by the Divine Power into the Body, and the wine into the Blood."

It promulgated the celebrated canon by which all the faithful over the years of discretion are commanded to receive the Sacrament of Penance and the Holy Eucharist at least once a year, and the latter Sacrament at Easter time, under penalty of being cut off from the fellowship of the Church. The impediment of kindred in marriage was declared to extend to the fourth degree. The Council enacted seventy disciplinary canons correcting and governing clerical life. It cut off heretics from the communion of the Church, and made them amenable to the civil authorities; it settled the rights of the claimants to the Albigensian territory, confirmed the election of Frederic II as Emperor of Germany, and the policy adopted by Innocent in all parts of Europe was confirmed and approved.

## X.

The Fourth Council of the Lateran was the culmination of Innocent's career; within eight months after its close, while on his way to establish a peace between the cities of Pisa and Genoa, he died in the city of Perugia on the 16th day of July, 1215. He was 56 years of age and had reigned 17 years, 6 months and 17 days; he was buried in the Cathedral of St. Lawrence in Perugia, where his body remained until the pontificate of Leo XIII, when it was removed to the Church of St. John Lateran. Innocent was of middle height, graceful in form and carriage, and the brilliancy of his eyes revealed the eager soul within.

His disposition was gentle and courteous, and many traits of his character have endeared him to us as being very human. Those whom he relied on he trusted implicitly, and he was often blamed for the acts of his legates, who deceived him and misused their powers; but in so vast an administration, the delegation of plenary power was unavoidable, and Innocent was ever ready to repair injuries and to punish the offenders. Many anecdotes are related of him showing his tenderness of heart and his fidelity to his old friends. Among his professors in Rome was Peter His-mail, whom soon after his election he made Bishop of Sutri. One of his professors in Paris, Peter of Corbeil, he sent on many important missions, and made him Archbishop of Sens. To show their intimate relations it is stated that in a dispute between them the Pope said to Peter, "I have made thee Bishop," to which Peter replied: "I have made thee Pope," referring to the wonderful progress which Innocent had made under his tuition in the study of theology and the Holy Scriptures, and which had contributed to his elevation to the Papacy.

From the day of his election he disposed of all the gifts which were offered in the basilica of St. Peter, and one-tenth of all his revenues, toward the support of the poor; all the gifts laid at his feet, according to ancient custom were immediately sent to his almoner. Of the money on hand in the Papal treasury at the time of his election, he distributed nearly all amongst the poor, the widows and orphans, the churches and convents of Rome. During a famine in Rome he fed 7,000 poor every day, in addition to those whom he was supporting at their homes; he considered it his special mission to support the poor and to care for the sick. Dr. James J. Walsh in a late number of "*The Messenger*," has demonstrated the fact that it is to Innocent III we owe the institution of city hospitals. The growth of city life in the early part of the thirteenth century, and the consequent danger from the spread of epidemics and the need of systematic treatment of the sick and injured, early attracted the attention of Innocent. He founded in Rome the great hospital of Santo Spirito, which exists to this day; it soon became famous for its treatment of medical and surgical cases; not only were those treated who came voluntarily, but attendants went out into the poorer quarters of the city to search for the sick and injured, who were then transported to the hospital. During his pontificate he succeeded by his influence and command in establishing hospitals on the model of the Santo Spirito in the cities in all parts of Christendom. The great work he did in founding these social blessings



has drawn from the celebrated pathologist Virchow the following remarkable testimonial.

"It may be recognized and admitted that it was reserved for the Roman Catholic Church, and above all for Innocent III, not only to open the bourne of Christian charity and mercy in all its fullness, but also to guide the life-giving streams into every branch of human life in an ordered manner. For this reason alone the interest in this man and in this time will never die out."

Innocent's knowledge of the Canon Law and of the Civil Law was so thorough that collections of his decisions were made after his death by succeeding pontiffs and have always been regarded as valuable precedents. Public sessions of his Consistory were held in Rome three times a week, at which he personally presided, examining documents and witnesses, displaying his familiarity with the laws and a marvelous insight into human nature. The decisions of this tribunal were so far-reaching from a political as well as from an ecclesiastical point of view, that they attracted to Rome a large concourse of clients, witnesses and spectators from every part of the Christian world; this was strikingly shown by the fact that during one summer when Innocent was holding his court at Viterbo, nearly forty thousand strangers sojourned for a month in that city.

Innocent preached frequently, his sermons were of a striking character, rich in imagery and permeated with the Holy Scriptures. He was the author of two works, one, "On Contempt of the World," showing the contemplative cast of his mind; the other, still highly valued, "On the Sacrifice of the Mass."

The letters of Innocent, six thousand of which have come down to us, "are yet," says Sismondi, "one of the great monuments of the Middle Ages." From them we can form a proper estimate of the genius of the man, his benevolence and love of rectitude, and the watchful care with which he governed the Church. Noticeable amongst their characteristics are his firmness, and the lofty tone which he uses in addressing monarchs. Writing to Philip Augustus to make peace with King John, he says: "If the complaint is just, thou wilt be forced by means of ecclesiastical discipline to refrain from making war upon him. If maternal kindness does not produce this effect, we will be compelled to make thee feel our paternal severity. Let come what will, we fear God more than men. We are willing to submit to persecution for the sake of justice; we will accept no advantage at the expense of truth." In another of his letters he says: "Our resolutions are fixed and unalterable, and neither gifts nor supplications, nor love, nor hate, can turn us from the right way."

## XI.

Innocent has had many critics, from the brilliant infidels, Gibbon and Hume, down to Mrs. Oliphant. Gibbon says: "Innocent could boast of the two most signal triumphs ever gained over good sense and humanity—the establishment of the dogma of Transubstantiation, and that of the first foundation of the Inquisition." But Innocent made known no new doctrine in the exposition of Transubstantiation; the Lateran Council simply enunciated in proper and precise terms the constant belief of the Church in the Real Presence. Prominent writers later than Gibbon fix the year 1229, during the pontificate of Gregory IX, as the date of the first appearance of the Inquisition as a recognized tribunal. This is supported by the authority of Lea; in his work on the Inquisition he shows that its gradual organization was the process of evolution and that the influence of Innocent was for mercy. In speaking of the prior crude forms adopted by ecclesiastical bodies and states in the inquisition of heresy, notably of the ordeal, he says: "With the study of the Roman law, however, this mode of procedure gradually fell into disfavor with the Church, and the enlightenment of Innocent III peremptorily forbade its use in 1212, when it was extensively employed by Henry of Vehringen, Bishop of Strassburg, to convert a number of heretics, while in 1215 the Council of Lateran, following the example of Alexander III and Lucius III, formally prohibited all ecclesiastics from taking part in the administration of ordeals of any kind."

It is asserted that he was ambitious, that he strove to make the Papacy a great political power in Europe, and that the supremacy he claimed and exercised over kings and states was an unwarranted arrogation of temporal power. That he was ambitious goes without saying, but there was no trace of personal vanity in his ambition; simple and unaffected in his private life, he had an exalted opinion of the dignity and power of his great office. He appealed to the pastors of churches and to the religious orders to be constant in their prayers to God that he might be kept from error, and that all his acts might inure to the glory of God and the welfare of Christendom.

He was ambitious, not for his own aggrandizement, but for the elevation and spread of the Church. As vice-gerent of God on earth he believed that he had the power to compel Kings in ruling their subjects to obey the laws of religion and morality.

In considering the supremacy claimed by Innocent, we must remember that we are dealing with an age that has gone by, when religion was the very life of society, with conditions which

disappeared at the rise of European nationalities. To the student of the Middle Ages, nothing is more evident than that in deposing monarchs for certain reasons, the Roman pontiffs were acting in accordance with the constitutional law of the day; and that this power was adapted to the social conditions of the age and was productive of great good in the preservation of peace and morality. Representatives from all the Christian powers were in attendance at the Lateran Council, but no protest was made against the passage of decrees vitally affecting political governments, and in which the power of the Church was asserted.

Speaking of the value of such supremacy properly exercised, Voltaire says: "The interests of the human race required some check on sovereigns and some protection for the life of the subject; this religious check could, by universal consent, be placed in the hands of the Pope. This chief pontiff by never meddling in temporal quarrels, except to appease them, by admonishing kings and nations of their duties, by reproving crimes, by inflicting excommunication on great offenders only, would have been regarded as the image of God on earth."

Many striking testimonials to the inestimable work done by the Church in the Middle Ages for the cause of civilization and Christianity have been given by profound writers. To use the strong words of Canon Farrar:

"During this period the Church was the one mighty witness for light in an age of darkness, for order in an age of lawlessness, for personal holiness in an epoch of licentious rage."

And the historian Lecky says:

"By infusing into Christianity the conception of a bond of unity that is superior to the divisions of nationhood, and of a moral tie that is superior to force, Catholicism laid the very foundations of modern civilization."

And Samuel Laing:

"Law, learning, education, science, all that we term civilization in the present social condition of the European people, spring from the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, and of the Catholic priesthood, over the kings and nobles of the Middle Ages."

In her ceremonies, Mother Church presents us with many evidences of her continuity and unity through the ages. In listening to the familiar hymn, "Veni Creator," and to the mournful plaint of the "Stabat Mater," both placed in the ritual by Innocent, and in viewing the throngs of the faithful kneeling at the altar rail at Easter time, obeying the Paschal precept, our minds are carried back seven hundred years to the time of the great Pope of the Middle Ages.

JOHN I. MULLANY.

Dubuque, Iowa.



GEOGRAPHY AND THE CHURCH IN THE MIDDLE  
AGES.

IN the course of a controversy which concerned the supposed opposition of the Church to the study and developments of science in general, but especially of the sciences related to medicine, during the middle ages, I was somewhat startled to have the sentence, "Geography and Geology were not tolerated," crop up as expressive of the Church attitude towards these sciences. Passing over for a moment the question of toleration of Geology, which is a distinctly modern subject, I could scarcely understand at first what was the basis for the thought that Geography, the science of the description of the earth's surface, and of the inhabitants as influenced by the physical conditions in which they live, could be considered as the special subject of condemnation by the Church. It is evident, however, that the false impression in the matter has arisen because of a confusion of ideas as regards one special subject in geography. It was concluded that the study of geography was practically impossible before modern times because the denial of the existence of antipodes precluded the possibility of a proper realization of the actual conditions of the terrestrial surface.

To think that this false impression, however, prevented the development of geography in the proper sense of that term would be a very serious mistake and a very short-sighted error of judgment. While there were some theologians who denied the existence of antipodes, there were others who as constantly accepted their existence. In this matter it must not be forgotten that Bishop Nicholas of Cusa, afterward a cardinal, said just before the close of the middle ages in the early fifteenth century: "I have long considered that this earth cannot be fixed, but moves as do the other stars." This would evidently mean that he considered the earth also round as the other stars seemed to be. As he does not insist on the opinion as new, it is probable that it had been entertained by many thinkers before him and had very likely been discussed for a long time by lecturers on Cosmology—the science of the ordered Universe, which was a favorite topic with scholastic philosophers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

As a matter of fact it seems clear that many of the great travelers and explorers of the later middle ages harbored the notion that the earth was round. As we shall note a little later in men-

tioning Sir John Mandeville's work the writer, whoever he was, took the pseudonym, believing thoroughly in the rotundity of the earth and did not hesitate to say in some striking expressions which have been often quoted, that he had heard of travelers who by traveling continually to the East had come back eventually to the point from which they started. While in the schools then the existence of antipodes may have been under discussion there was a practical acceptance of their existence among those who were better informed with regard to countries and people and all the other topics which form the proper subject matter, of geography.

It must be realized, moreover, that though the existence of the antipodes was an important matter in geography it was really a side issue compared with many other questions relating to the earth's surface and its inhabitants which the medieval mind was occupied. To consider that no knowledge of geography could be obtained until there was a definite acceptance of the right view of the earth's surface, would be to obliterate much precious knowledge. The argument as to the existence of antipodes as it was carried was entirely outside of geography properly so-called. It never influenced in the slightest degree the men who were consciously and unconsciously laying deep and broad the foundations of modern geography. To consider such a matter as vital to the development of as many-sided a subject as geography illustrates very typically the narrowness of view of the modern scholar who can see the value of nothing which does not entirely accord with modern knowledge. The really interesting historian of knowledge, however, is he who can point out the beginnings of what we now know, in unexpected quarters in the medieval mind.

A very similar state of affairs existed with regard to astronomy. It is as if we were to declare that there could be no advances in astronomy until the acceptance of the Copernican theory. Until the admission of course that not the earth but the sun was the centre of our universe, observations made upon the heavens could not have their full significance, but to take this to mean that such observations were entirely without significance is to misunderstand astronomical progress. Any such conclusion would blot out of the history of astronomy some of its very important chapters. Copernicus' doctrine was not absolutely accepted by astronomers for more than a century after its presentation in complete form and nearly two centuries after its preliminary presentation. Francis Bacon, the putative father of modern

inductive science, who lived a century after Copernicus, weighed all the arguments for and against the great clerical astronomer's doctrine and decided against it. Tycho Brahe, the great Danish astronomer, was of the same opinion, though during a long lifetime he had made many more interesting and important observations on the positions of the heavenly bodies, their relations to one another, and to the earth and sun.

The history of astronomy does not begin with a full acceptance of the Copernican system, and in the same way the history of geography does not begin with the absolute acceptance of the doctrine of the rotundity of the earth. Many valuable observations had been made by travelers before geography had advanced to this point, and they served to fill up gaps in knowledge and proved an incentive to further exploration in subsequent centuries.

As the story of these travels and explorations is really a glorious chapter in the history of the Church's encouragement of things intellectual, as well as an interesting recital of important origins in a great department of science it has seemed worth telling briefly. The thirteenth century was a great leader in this matter as in so many others. Undoubtedly one of the greatest travelers and explorers of all times was Marco Polo, whose book was for so long considered to be mainly made up of imaginary descriptions of things and places never seen, but which the development of modern geographical science, by travels and expeditions, has proved to be one of the most valuable contributions to this department of knowledge that was ever made. It took many centuries for Marco Polo to come to his own in this respect, but the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have almost more than made up for their predecessors' neglect. Marco Polo suffered the same fate as Herodotus, of whom Voltaire sneered, "Father of history, say, rather, father of lies." So long as succeeding generations had no knowledge themselves of the things which both of these great writers had described they were distrusted and even treated contemptuously. Just as soon, however, as definite knowledge began to come, then it was seen how wonderfully accurate both of them were in their descriptions of things they had actually seen, though they admitted certain over-wonderful stories on the authority of others. Herodotus has now come to be acknowledged one of the greatest of historians. In his lives of celebrated travelers James Augustus St. John stated the change of mind with regard to Marco Polo rather forcibly.



"When the travels of Marco Polo first appeared, they were generally regarded as fiction; and as this absurd belief had so far gained ground, that when he lay upon his deathbed, his friends and near relatives, coming to take their eternal adieu, conjured him as he valued the salvation of his soul, to retract whatever he had advanced in his book, or at least many such passages as every person looked upon as untrue; but the traveler whose conscience was untouched upon that score, declared solemnly in that awful moment, that far from being guilty of exaggeration, he had not described one-half of the wonderful things which he had beheld. Such was the reception which the discoveries of this extraordinary man experienced when first promulgated. By degrees, however, as enterprise lifted more and more the veil from central and eastern Asia the relations of our travelers rose in the estimation of geographers; and now that the world though containing many unknown tracts has been more successfully explored, we begin to perceive that Marco Polo, like Herodotus, was a man of the most rigid veracity, whose testimony presumptuous ignorance alone can call in question."

After all we have said with regard to anticipations of what is most modern in human interest it will not be so surprising to find that this traveler of the thirteenth century succeeded in finding his way through most of the countries that were the subject of thrilling experiences in exploration in the nineteenth century, and left a record of definite information with regard to them which must have proved a great incentive to geographical study down until Columbus' time. There is many a fable that clings around the name of Marco Polo, but this distinguished traveler needs no fictitious adornments of his tale to make him one of the greatest explorers of all time. It is sometimes said that he helped to introduce many important inventions into Europe and one even finds his name connected with the Mariner's Compass and with gunpowder. There are probably no good grounds for thinking that Europe owes any knowledge of either of these great inventions to the Venetian traveler. With regard to printing, there is much more doubt and Polo's passage with regard to movable blocks for printing paper money as used in China may have proved suggestive.

There is no need, however, of surmises in order to increase his fame, for the simple story of his travels is quite sufficient for his reputation for all time. As has been well said, most of the modern travelers and explorers have only been developing what Polo indicated at least in outline, and they have been scarcely more than describing with more precision of detail what he first touched upon and brought to general notice. When it is remembered that he visited such cities in Eastern Turkestan as Kashgar, Yarkand and Khotan, which have been the subject of much curiosity in quite recent years, that he had visited Thibet or at least had traveled along its frontier, that to him the mediaeval world owed some definite knowledge of the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia and all that it was to know of China for cen-

turies almost, his merits will be readily appreciated. As a matter of fact, there was scarcely an interesting country of the East of which Marco Polo did not have something to relate from his own personal experiences. He told of Burmah, of Siam, of Cochin China, of Japan, of Sumatra, and of the other islands of the great archipelago, of Ceylon and of India, and all of these not in the fabulous dreamland spirit of one who has not been in contact with the East, but in very definite and precise fashion. Nor was this all. He had heard and could tell much, though his geographical lore was legendary and rather dim, of the coast of Zanzibar, of the vast and distant Madagascar, and in the remotely opposite direction of Siberia, of the shores of the Arctic Ocean, and of the curious customs of the inhabitants of those distant countries.

It is not surprising then that the twentieth century, so interested in travel and exploration, should be ready to lay its tributes at the feet of Marco Polo, and that one of the important book announcements of recent years should be that of the publication of an annotated edition of Marco Polo from the hands of a modern explorer, who considered that there was not better way of putting definitely before the public in its true historical aspect the evolution of modern geographical knowledge with regard to eastern countries.

It can scarcely fail to be surprising to the modern mind that Polo should practically have been forced into print. He had none of the itch of the modern traveler for publicity. The story of his travels he had often told, and because of the wondrous tales he could unfold and the large numbers he found it frequently so necessary to use, in order to give proper ideas of what he had seen in some of his wanderings, had acquired the nickname of Marco Million. He had never thought, however, of committing his story to writing, or perhaps he feared the drudgery of such literary labor. After his return from his travels, however, he had bravely accepted a patriot's duty of fighting for his native country on board one of her galleys and was captured by the Genoese in a famous sea fight in the Adriatic in 1298. He was taken prisoner and remained in captivity in Genoa for nearly a year.

It was during this time that one Rusticiano, a writer by profession, was attracted to him and tempted him to tell him the complete story of his travels in order that they might be put into connected form. Rusticiano was a Pisan who had been a compiler of French romances, and accordingly Polo's story was first told in French prose. It may seem surprising that a native of

Pisa should write out in the French language a Venetian prisoner's story while both of them were in Genoa. French was, however, more commonly used by literary folk than any other modern language, and indeed was only surpassed in this respect by Italian. The story was told within a few years after Dante had begun his *Divine Comedy*, which was to establish the vulgar Tuscan tongue as the classic idiom of Italy. Probably most of Dante's friends considered that the poet was making a mistake in trusting the expression of his great thoughts in poetry to his native Tuscan. More than half a century later Petrarch preferred to write the great epic on which his fame was to depend—his *Africa*—in Latin, and thus condemned it to even more complete obscurity than might otherwise have been the case.

It is not surprising that Rusticiano should have chosen French, since he naturally wished his story of Polo's travels to be read by as many people as possible and realized that it would be of quite as much interest to ordinary folk as to the literary circles of Europe. How interesting the story is only those who have read it even with the knowledge required by all the other explorers since his time, can properly appreciate. It lacks entirely the egotistic quality that usually characterizes an explorer's account of his travels, and indeed there can scarcely fail to be something of disappointment because of this fact. No doubt a touch more of personal adventure would have added to the interest of the book. It was not a characteristic of the thirteenth century, however, to insist on the merely personal and consequently the world has lost a treat it might otherwise have had. There is no question, however, of the greatness of Polo's work as a traveler, nor of the glory that was shed by it on the thirteenth century. Like nearly everything else that was done in this marvelous century he represents the acme of successful endeavor in his special line down even to our own time..

It has sometimes been said that Marco Polo's work greatly influenced Columbus, and encouraged him in his attempt to seek India by sailing around the Globe. Of this, however, there is considerable doubt. We have learned in recent times that a very definite tradition with regard to the possibility of finding land by sailing straight westward over the Atlantic existed before Columbus' time. My friend, Father DeRoo, of Portland, who has written two very interesting volumes on the History of America before Columbus, does not hesitate to say that Columbus may even have met in his travels and spoken with sailors who had touched on some portions of the American continent, and that



of course the traditions with regard to Greenland were very clear. Polo's indirect influence on Columbus by his creation of an interest in geographical matters generally is much more clear. There can be no doubt of how much his work succeeded in drawing men's minds to geographical questions during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

After Marco Polo undoubtedly the most enterprising explorer and interesting writer on travel of the thirteenth century was John of Carpini, an author of a wonderful series of descriptions of things seen in Northern Asia. Like so many other of the travelers and explorers of his time John was a Franciscan Friar and seems to have been one of the companions and disciples of St. Francis of Assisi, whom he joined when he was only a young man himself, very early in St. Francis' career. Before going on his missionary and ambassadorial expedition he had been one of the most prominent men in the order founded by St. Francis. He had much to do with its propagation among the northern nations of Europe and occupied successively the offices of custos or prior in Saxony and of provincial in Germany. He seems afterwards to have been sent as an organizer into Spain and to have gone even as far as Barbary Coast.

It is not surprising then, that when in 1245 Pope Innocent IV (some time after the Mongol invasion of Eastern Europe and the disastrous battle of Legamites, which threatened to place European civilization and Christianity in the power of the Tartars) resolved to send a mission to the Tartar monarch, John of Carpini was selected for the dangerous and important mission.

At this time Friar John was more than 60 years of age and such was the confidence in his ability and in his executive power that everything on the embassy was committed to his discretion. He started from Lyons on Easter Day, 1245. He sought the counsel first of his old friend, Wenceslaus, King of Bohemia, and from that country took with him another friar, a Pole, to act as his interpreter. The first stage in his journey was at Kiev, and from here, having crossed the Dnieper and the Don to the Volga, he reached the camp of Batu at this the senior member of Chinghis Khan's family. Batu, after exchanging presents, allowed them to proceed to the court of the supreme Khan in Mongolia. As Col. Yule says, the stout-hearted old man rode on horseback something like three thousand miles in the next hundred days. The bodies of himself and companion had to be tightly bandaged to enable them to stand the excessible fatigue of this enormous ride, which led them across the Ural mountains and river past the

northern part of the Caspian across the Jaxartes, whose name they could not find out along the Dzungarian Lake till they reached the imperial camp called the Yellow Pavilion, near the Orkhon river. There had been an interregnum in the empire which was terminated by a formal election while the Friars were at the Yellow Pavilion, where they had an opportunity to see four thousand envoys and deputies from all parts of Asia and Eastern Europe, who brought with them the homage and tributes and presents for the rulers to be elected.

It was not for three months after this, in November, that the Emperor dismissed them with a letter to the Pope written in Latin, Arabic and Mongolian, but containing only a brief, imperious assertion that the Khan of the Tartars was the scourge of God for Christianity and that he must fulfill his mission. Then, sad at heart, the ambassadors began their homeward journey in the midst of winter. Their sufferings can be better imagined than described, and Friar John, who does not dwell on them, tells enough of them to make their realization comparatively easy. They reached Kiev seven months later, in June, where they were welcomed by the Slavonic Christians as arisen from the dead, then continued their journey to Lyons, where they delivered the Khan's letter to the Pope.

Friar John embodied the information that he had obtained in this journey in a book called *Liber Tartarorum* (the Book of the Tartars, or, according to another manuscript, *History of the Mongols* whom we call Tartars). Col. Yule notes that like other medieval monks' itineraries it shows an entire absence of that characteristic traveler's egotism with which we have become abundantly familiar in more recent years, and contains very little personal narrative. We know that John was a stout man and this, in addition to his age when he went on the mission, cannot but make us realize the thoroughly unselfish spirit with which he followed the call of holy obedience to undertake a work that seemed sure to prove fatal and that would inevitably bring in its train suffering of the severest kind. Of the critical historical value of his book a good idea can be obtained from the fact that half a century ago an educated Mongol, Galsang Gomboyev, in the *Historical and Philological Bulletin of the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg*, reviewed it and bore testimony to the great accuracy of its statements, to the care with which its details had been elaborated, and the evidently personal character of all its observations.

Friar John's books attracted the attention of compilers of in-

formation with regard to countries very soon after it was issued, and an abridgement of it is to be found in the encyclopedia of Vincent of Beauvais, which was written shortly after the middle of the thirteenth century. At the end of the sixteenth century Hakluyt published portions of the original work, as did Borgeron at the beginning of the seventeenth century. The geographical society of Paris published a fine edition of the work about the middle of the nineteenth century, and at the same time a brief narrative taken down from the lips of John's companion, Friar Benedict, the Pole, which is somewhat more personal in its character and fully substantiated all that Friar John had written.

As can readily be understood, the curiosity of his contemporaries was deeply aroused so that Friar John had to tell his story many times after his return. Hence the necessity he found himself under of committing it to paper so as to save himself from the bother of telling it all over again, and in order that his brother Franciscans throughout the world might have the opportunity to read it.

Col. Yule says the book must have been prepared immediately after his return, for the Friar Salembene, who met him in France in the very year of his return, (1247), gives us very interesting particulars:

"He was a clever and conversible man, well lettered, a great discourser, and full of diversity of experience. He wrote a big book about the Tartars (sic) and about other marvels that he had seen and whenever he felt weary of telling about the Tartars, he would cause this book of his to be read, as I have often heard and seen." Chron. Fr. Salembene Parmensis in Monum. Histor. ad Provinciam Placent. Pertinentia, Parma 1857.)

Another important traveler of the thirteenth century whose work has been the theme of praise and extensive annotation in modern times was William of Rubruk, usually known under the name of Rubruquis, a Franciscan friar thought, as the result of recent investigations probably to owe his cognomen to his birth in the little town of Rubruk in Brabant (now Belgium), who was the author of a remarkable narrative of Asiatic travel during the thirteenth century, and whose death seems to have taken place about 1298. The name Rubruquis has been commonly used to designate him because it is found in the Latin original of his work which was printed by Haluyt in his collection of Voyages at the end of the sixteenth century. Friar William was sent partly as an ambassador and partly as an explorer by Louis IX of France into Tartary. At that time Chinghis, or Jenghis Khan, ruled over an immense empire in the Orient, and King Louis was deeply interested in introducing Christianity into the East, and if



possible making the great ruler a Christian. About the middle of the thirteenth century a rumor spread throughout Europe that one of the nephews of the great Khan had embraced Christianity. St. Louis thought this a favorable opportunity for getting in touch with Jenghis himself, and so he dispatched at least two missions into Tartary at the head of the second of which was William of Rubruk.

His accounts of his travels proved most interesting reading to his own and to many subsequent generations, perhaps to none more than our own. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* (ninth edition) says that the narrative of his journey is everywhere full of life and interest and some details of his travels will show the reasons for this.

Rubruk and his party landed on the Crimean coast at Sudak or Soldia, a port which was the chief seat of communication between the Mediterranean countries and what is now Southern Russia. The Friar succeeded in making his way from here to the great Khan's court, which was then held not far from Karakorum. This journey was not less than five thousand miles. The route taken has been worked out by laborious study and the key to it is the description given of the country intervening between the basin of the Talas and Lake Ala-Kul. This enables the whole geography of the region including the passage of the River Ili, the plain south of Bal Cash, and the Ala-Kul itself, to be identified beyond all reasonable doubt.

The return was made during the summer time and the route lay much farther to the north. The travelers traversed the Jabkan valley and passed north of the River Bal Cash, following a rather direct course, which led them to the mouth of the Volga. From here they traveled south past Derbend and Shamakii to the Uraxes and on through Iconium to the coast of Cilicia, and finally to the port of Ayas, where they embarked for Cyprus. All during his travels Friar William made observations on men and cities, and rivers and mountains, and languages and customs, implements and utensils, and most of these modern criticism has accepted as representing the actual state of things as they would appear to a medieval sightseer. Occasionally during the period intervening between his time and our own scholars who thought that they knew better have been conceited enough to believe themselves in a position to point out glaring errors in Rubriquis' accounts of what he saw. In these cases, however, subsequent investigation and discovery have proved the accuracy of the earlier observations rather than the modern scholar's cor-

rections. An excellent example of this is quoted in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* article on Rubruquis already referred to.

The writer says:

"This sagacious and honest observer is denounced as an ignorant and untruthful blunderer by Isaac Jacob Schmidt; (a man, no doubt, of useful learning, of a kind rare in his day, but narrow and long headed and in natural acumen and candour far inferior to the thirteenth century friar whom he maligns), simply because the evidence of the latter as to the Turkish dialect of the Ungurs traversed a pet heresy long since exploded which Schmidt entertained, viz.: that the Higurs were by race and language Tibetan."

Some of the descriptions of the towns through which the travelers passed are interesting because of comparisons with towns of corresponding size in Europe. Karakorum, for instance, was described as a small city about the same size as the town of St. Denis, near Paris. In Karakorum the ambassador missionary maintained a public disputation with certain pagan priests in the presence of three of the secretaries of the Khan. The religion of these umpires is rather interesting from its diversity; the first was a Christian, the second a Mohammedan, and the third a Buddhist. A very curious feature of the disputation was the fact that the Khan ordered under pain of death that none of the disputants should slander, traduce or abuse his adversaries or endeavor by rumor or insinuation to excite popular indignation against them. This would seem to indicate that the great Tartar Khan, who is usually considered to have been a cruel, ignorant despot, whose one quality that gave him supremacy was military valor, was really a large, liberal-minded man. His idea seems to have been to discover the truth of these different religions and adopt that one which was adjudged to have the best groundwork of reason for it. It is easy to understand, however, that such a disputation argued through interpreters wholly ignorant of the subject and without any proper understanding of the nice distinctions of words or any practice in conveying their proper significance could come to no serious conclusion. The arguments, therefore, fell flat and a decision was not rendered.

Friar William's work was not unappreciated by his contemporaries, and even its scientific value was thoroughly realized. It is not surprising of course that his great contemporary in the Franciscan order, Roger Bacon, should have come to the knowledge of his Brother Minorite's work book and should have made frequent and copious quotations from it in the geographical section of his *Opus Majus*, which was written some time during the seventh decade of the thirteenth century. Bacon says that Brother William traversed the Oriental and Northern regions and the places adjacent to them, and wrote accounts of them for

the illustrious King of France, who sent him on the expedition to Tartary. He adds: I have read his book diligently and have compared it with similar accounts. Roger Bacon recognized by a sort of intuition of his own certain passages which have proved to be the best in recent times. The description for instance of the Caspian was the best down to this time, and Friar William corrects the error made by Isidore and which had generally been accepted before this that the Caspian Sea was a gulf. Rubruk, as quoted by Roger Bacon, states very explicitly that it nowhere touches the ocean, but is surrounded on all sides by land. For those who do not think that the foundation of scientific geography was laid until recent times a little consultation of Roger Bacon's *Opus Majus* would undoubtedly be a revelation.

It is probably with regard to language that one might reasonably expect to find least that would be of interest to modern scholars in Friar William's book. As might easily have been gathered from previous references, however, it is here that the most frequent surprises as to the acuity of this medieval traveler await the modern reader. Scientific philology is so much a product of the last century that it is difficult to understand how this old-time missionary was able to reach so many almost intuitive recognitions of the origin and relationships of the languages of the people among whom he traveled. He came in contact with the group of nations occupying what is now known as the near East, whose languages, as is well known have constituted a series of the most difficult problems with which philology had to deal until its thorough establishment on scientific lines during the nineteenth century enabled it to separate them properly. It is all the more surprising then to find that Friar William should have so much in his book, and even the modern philologist will read with attention and unstinted admiration.

With regard to this, Col. Yule, whose personal experiences makes him a trustworthy guide in such matters, has written a paragraph which contains so much compressed information that we venture to quote it entire. It furnishes the grounds for the claim (which might seem overstrained if it were not that its author was himself one of the greatest of modern explorers) that William was "an acute and most intelligent observer, keen in the acquisition of knowledge, and the author in fact of one of the best narratives of travel in existence."

"Of his interest and acumen in matters of language we may cite examples. The language of the Pascatir (or Bashkirds) and of the Hungarians is the same, as he had learned from Dominicans who had been among them. The language of the Ruthenians, Poles, Bohemians and Slavonians is one, and is



the same with that of the Wandals or Wends. In the town of Equinus (immediately beyond the Ili, perhaps Aspara) the people were Mohammedans speaking Persian, though so far remote from Persia. The Yugurs (or Uigurs) of the country about the Cailac had formed a language and character of their own, and in that language and character the Nestorians of the tract used to perform their sacred offices and write their books. The Yugurs are those among whom are found the fountain and root of the Turkish and Comanian tongue. Their character has been adopted by the Monghals. In using it they begin writing from the top and write downwards, whilst line follows line from left to right. The Nestorians say their service, and have their holy book in Syriac, but know nothing of the language, just as some of our Monks sing the mass without knowing Latin. The Tibet people write as we do, and their letters have a strong resemblance to ours. The Tangut people write from right to left like the Arabs, and their lines advance upwards."

There were other matters besides language and religion on which Friar William made observations and though his book is eminently human, giving us a very interesting view of his own personality, and of his difficulties with his dragoman which many a modern Eastern traveler will sympathize with, and a picture that includes the detail that he was a very heavy man, *valde ponderosus*, which makes his travel on horseback for some 10,000 miles all the more wonderful; it also contains a mass of particulars marvelously true, or so near the truth as to be almost more interesting, as to Asiatic nature, ethnography, manners, morals, commercial customs and nearly everything else relating to the life of the peoples among whom he traveled. A typical example is to be found in the following suggestive paragraph:

"The current money of Cathay is of cotton paper, a palm in length and breadth, and on this they print lines like those of Mangu Kahns seal:—"imprimunt lineas sicut est sigillum Mangu"—(a remarkable expression). They write with a painter's pencil and combine in one character several letters forming one expression:—"faciunt in una figura plures literas comprehendentes unam dictonem"—(a still more remarkable utterance, showing an approximate apprehension of the nature of Chinese writing).

There are other distinguished travelers whose inspiration came to them during the thirteenth century though their works were published in the early part of the next century. Some of these we know mainly through their adaptation and incorporation into his work without due recognition by that first great writer of spurious travels, Sir John Mandeville. Mandeville's work was probably written some time during the early part of the second half of the fourteenth century, but he used material gathered from travelers of the end of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the next century. Sir Henry Yule has pointed out that by far the greater part of the supposed more distant travels of Sir John Mandeville were appropriated from the narrative of Friar Odoric, a monk who became a member of the Franciscan order about the end of the thirteenth century, and whose travels as a missionary in the East gave him the opportunities to collect

a precious fund of information which is contained in Odoric's famous story of his voyages. Of Odoric himself we shall have something to say presently.

In the meantime it seems well worth while calling to attention that, though the narrative of Sir John Mandeville, as it is called, and which may have been written by a French physician of the name of John of Burgoigne under the now well known pseudonym contains a number of interesting anticipations of facts that were supposed to enter into the domain of human knowledge much later in the intellectual development of the race. In certain passages, and especially in one which is familiar from its being cited by Dr. Johnson in the preface of his dictionary, Mandeville, to use the name by which the story is best known, shows that he had a correct idea of the form of the earth and of position in latitude as it could be ascertained by observation of the Polar star. He knew also as we noted at the beginning of this article, that there were antipodes, and if ships were sent on voyages of discovery they might sail completely around the world. As Col. Yule points out, Mandeville tells a curious story which he had heard in his youth of how "a worthy man did travel ever eastward until he came to his own country again."

Friar Odoric, of whom we have already spoken, must be considered as the next great missionary traveler of this age. He took Franciscan vows when scarcely a boy and was encouraged to travel in the East by the example of his Holy Father, St. Francis, who, it will be recalled, went to the East to convert Saladin, and also by the interest and missionary zeal to convert the East, which had been aroused by Marco Polo's travels. His long journeys will be more readily understood, however, if we realize as is stated in the article on him in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, an authority that will surely be unsuspected of too great partiality for the work of Catholic missionaries, that "There had arisen also during the latter half of the thirteenth century an energetic missionary action, extending all over the East on the part of both the new orders of Preaching and Minorite (or Dominican and Franciscan) Friars which had caused the members of these orders, of the last especially, to become established in Persia and what is now Southern Russia, in Tartary and in China.

In the course of his travels in the East Odoric visited Malabar, touching at Pandarini (20 miles north of Calicut) at Craganore and at Quilon, proceeding thence to Ceylon and to the shrine of St. Thomas at Mailapur near Madras.

Even more interesting than his travels in India, however, are

those in China. He sailed from the Hindustan Peninsula in a Chinese junk to Sumatra, visiting various ports on the northern coast of that island and telling something about the inhabitants and the customs of the country. According to Sir Henry Yule he then visited Java and it would seem also the coast of Borneo, finally reaching Kanton at the time known to Western Asiatics as Chil Kalan or Great China. From here he went to the great ports of Fuhkeen and Schwan Chow Chow. Here he found two houses of his order; thence he proceeded to Fuchau, from which place he struck across the mountains into Chekaeng, and then visited Hang Chow, at that time renowned under the name of Gansay, which modern authorities in exploration have suggested might be King Sae, the Chinese name for royal residence, which was then one of the greatest cities of the world. Thence Odoric passed northward by Kankin and crossing the great Kiang embarked on the Grand Canal and traveled to Cambaluc or Peking, where he remained for three years, and where it is thought that he was attached to one of the churches founded by Archbishop John of Montecorvino, who was at this time in extreme old age.

The most surprising part of Odoric's travels were still to come. When the fever for traveling came upon him again he turned almost directly westward to the great wall and through Shenshua. From here the adventurous traveler (we are still practically quoting Sir Henry Yule) entered Thibet and appears to have visited Lhasa. Considering how much of interest has been aroused by recent attempts to enter Lhasa, and the surprising adventures that men have gone through in the attempt, the success of this medieval monk in such an expedition would seem incredible if it were not substantiated by documents that place the matter beyond all doubt even in the minds of the most distinguished modern authorities in geography and exploration. How Odoric returned home is not definitely known though certain fragmentary notices seem to indicate that he passed through Khorasan and probably Tabriz to Europe.

It only remains to complete the interest of Odoric's wondrous tale to add that during a large portion of these years and long journeys his companion was Friar James, an Irishman, who had been attracted to Italy in order to become a Franciscan. To him, as appears from a record in the public books of the town of Udine in Italy, where the monastery of which both he and Odoric were members, was situate, a present of two marks was made by the municipal authorities shortly after Odoric's death. The reason for the gift was stated to be that the Irish Friar had



been for the love of God and of Odoric (a typical Celtic expression and characteristic) a companion of the blessed Odoric in his wanderings. Unfortunately Odoric died within two years after his return, though not until the story of his travels had been taken down in homely Latin by Friar William of Bologna. Shortly after his death Odoric became an object of reverence on the part of his brother friars and of devotion on the part of the people who recognized the wonderful apostolic spirit that he had displayed. In his long wanderings and the patience and good will with which he had borne sufferings and hardships for the sake of winning the souls of those outside the Church of Christ. He was formally raised to the Altars under the name of Blessed Odoric by Papal authority some four centuries later.

We may indicate a few passages from his book which stamp Odoric as a genuine and original traveler. He is the first European who mentions Sumatra. The cannibalism and community of wives which he attributes to certain races of that island certainly belong to it, or to islands closely adjoining. His description of Sago in the archipelago is not free from errors, but they are the errors of an eye-witness. In China his mention of Canton by the name of Chin Kalan, his description of the custom of fishing with tame cormorants, of the habit of letting the fingernails grow extravagantly, and of the compression of women's feet, as well as of the division of the empire into twelve provinces, with four chief ministers, are all peculiar to him among the travelers of that age. Marco Polo omits them all.

Sir Henry Yule summed up his opinion of Odoric in the following striking passage which bears testimony also to the healthy curiosity of the times, scientific interest in the strict sense of the term, with regard to all these original sources of information which were recognized as valuable because first hand.

"The numerous MSS. of Odoric's narrative that have come down to our time (upwards of forty are known), and chiefly from the fourteenth century, shows how speedily and widely it acquired popularity. It does not deserve the charge of general mendacity brought up against it by some, though the language of other writers who have spoken of the traveler as a man of learning is still more injudicious. Like most of the medieval travelers, he is indiscriminating in accepting strange tales; but while some of these are the habitual stories of the age, many particulars which he recited attest the genuine character of the narrative and some of those which Tiraboschi and others have condemned as mendacious interpolations are the very seals of truth."

Besides Odoric there is another monkish traveler from whom Mandeville has borrowed much, though without giving him any credit. This is the well-known Praemonstratensian monk Hay-

ton, who is said to have been a member of a princely Armenian family and who just at the beginning of the fourteenth century dictated a work on the affairs of the Orient and especially the history of the nearer East in his own time, of which from the place of his nativity and bringing up he had abundant information, while he found all round him in France, where he was living at the time the greatest thirst for knowledge with regard to this part of the world. His book seems to have been dictated originally in French at Poitiers and attracted great attention because of its subject, many copies of it being made and translations into other languages produced within a few years after its original appearance. Mandeville apparently did not have access to the account of Marco Polo's writings, since only one circumstance that can be definitely traced to Polo occurs in Mandeville and this seems to have come to him through Odoric.

The story of these monkish travelers is a forcible reminder of how much the missionaries accomplished for geography, ethnology and ethnography in the thirteenth century as they did in succeeding centuries. If what the missionaries have added to these sciences were to have been lost there would have been enormous gaps in the knowledge with which modern scholars began their scientific labors in philology. It may be a surprise to most people, however, to be thus forcibly reminded of the wonderful evangelizing spirit which characterizes the later middle age. Needless to say, these graduates of the thirteenth century universities who wandered in distant eastern lands brought with them their European culture for the uplifting of the Orientals and brought back to Europe many ideas that were to be fruitful sources of suggestions, not only for geographical, ethnological, philological and other departments of learning, but also in manufactures and in arts.

We mentioned the fact that Odoric in his travels eventually reached Cambalus or Peking, where he found Archbishop John of Monte-Corvino still alive, though at an advanced age, and was probably attached for the three years of his stay to one of the churches that had been founded by this marvelous old friar, who had been made archbishop because of his wonderful power of organizing and administration displayed during his earlier career as a missionary. The story of this grand old man of the early Franciscan missions is another one of the romances of thirteenth century travels and exploration which well deserves to be studied in detail. Unfortunately the old archbishop was too much occupied with his work as a missionary and an ecclesiastic to return

to Europe in order to tell of it or to write out any lengthy account of his experiences. Like many another great man of the thirteenth century he was a doer and not a writer and, but for the casual mention of him by others, the records of his deeds would only be found in certain ecclesiastical records and his work would now be known to the Master alone for whom it was so unselfishly done.

It will be noted that most of these traveling missionaries were Franciscans, but it must not be thought that it was only the Franciscans who went on such missions. The Dominicans established about the same time, at the beginning also of the thirteenth century, also did wonderful missionary work, but did not record it as did their Franciscan brothers. Undoubtedly the Franciscans surpassed them in the extent of their labors, but the Dominicans were founded with the idea of preaching and uplifting the people of Europe rather than of spreading the good news of the Gospel outside the bounds of Christianity, as it then existed. From the very earliest traditions of their order the Franciscans had their eyes attracted towards the East. The story of St. Francis himself, who went to the Holy Land at the end of the twelfth century in order to convert Saladin, the eastern monarch whose name has been made famous by the stories of the crusade in which Richard Coeur de Lion took part, have been doubted, but they seem to be founded on too good contemporary authority to be considered as entirely apocryphal. St. Francis' heart went out to those in darkness who knew nothing of the Christ whom he had learned to love so ardently, and it was the supreme desire of his life that the good tidings of Christianity should be spread by his followers all over the world. While they did this great work they accomplished unwittingly great things in all the series of sciences now grasped under the term geography and gathered precious information as to the races of men, their relations to one another, and to the part of the earth in which they live. The scientific progress made will always redound largely to their credit in the story of intellectual development of modern Europe. Most of their work was far ahead of the times and was not properly appreciated until quite recent generations, but this must only emphasize our sympathy for those obscure, patient but fruitful workers in a great field of human knowledge. As to what should be thought of those ignorant of their work who proclaim that the Church did not tolerate geography is hard to say. Our geographical knowledge comes mainly from travelers whose wish it is to gain commercial op-



portunities for themselves or their compatriots. That of the middle ages was gained by men who wished anxiously to spread the light of Christianity throughout the world. The geographical societies of those earlier days were the religious orders who sent out the explorers and travelers and furnished them on their return with an enthusiastic audience to hear their stories and then helped to disseminate their books all over the civilized world.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York, N. Y.

---

### FRA ANGELICO.

HALF way up the hill of Fiesole, overlooking Florence, the lovely "City of the Flowers," stands the old Dominican Monastery of San Domenico, so long the home of the peerless painter, the world-famous monk, known as Fra Angelico. The convent was founded in the year 1406, by Blessed John Dominici, afterwards Cardinal Archbishop of Ragusa. Blessed John had been chosen by Saint Raymond of Capua, at that time, General of the Dominican Order, as Vicar-General of all those convents, the inmates of which were willing to return to the rigor of the primitive discipline. Having established the Reformed Rule in Venice, Cortona, and other Italian cities, Blessed John conceived an ardent desire to see it restored in the famous monastery of his native city, Santa Maria Novella. Numerous obstacles arose to hinder the good work, and the holy Dominican wisely resolved to found a new convent in some retired spot, far from the distractions of the city. His confrere in religion, Fra Jacopo Altoviti, then Bishop of Fiesole, came to his assistance, and at his request, gave him a plot of ground situated in the parish of the ancient cathedral of Fiesole. The building of the church and convent was immediately commenced. The work was carried on with such zeal and earnestness that in the following year (1406), Blessed John with thirteen companions took up his abode in the new convent, whither, ere long, flocked numerous candidates for admission to that home of prayer and study. In the year 1406, the youth, Antonio Pierozzi, then barely sixteen, presented himself to Blessed John, requesting from him the holy habit of Saint Dominic. Wishing to test the vocation of the applicant, who, on being questioned as to the nature of his studies, had replied that his favourite reading was Canon Law, Blessed John told him that it was

not his custom to receive as novices any but those who mastered the "Decretum," telling him at the same time to return when he had committed to memory the whole of this abstruse volume. At the close of the same year the youth re-appeared, having actually accomplished the herculean task. Blessed John hesitated no longer; he bestowed the habit on the ardent youth who was destined to become such a brilliant light in the Annals of the Church in Florence. He was nominated Archbishop of Florence in 1459, and we now know him as Saint Antoninus.

One day, in the year 1408, two brothers knocked at the gate of the convent at Fiesole, seeking admission among the Brethren of St. Dominic. The elder of the two brothers, then 21 years of age, was he whose name will go down to all time inscribed on the deathless page of Fame as Fra Angelico.

Guido, or Guidolino, to give him his baptismal name, was born in 1387, at Vicchio, a beautiful village in the Appennines in the Province of Mugello, not far distant from the birthplace of Giotto.

Little or nothing is known of the Angelical Painter's early works beyond the fact that he was called Guido, or Guidolino; that his father's name was Peter, and that he had a brother younger than himself, whose name was afterwards associated with his sanctity and his genius. The most precious record of those early days is from the pen of Vasari:—

"He could easily have led a pleasant life in the world, for he was in easy circumstances, and his brilliant talent would have supplied him with the means to gratify all his desires, but his sweet and humble spirit preferred to seek salvation in the shadow of the cloister, and he entered the Dominican Order."

Doubtless the young aspirants to the religious state were closely questioned as to the nature of their studies, and they were not admitted within the walls of the monastery until they had given some proof of their suitability. It was discovered that Guido possessed undoubted talent for painting, while his brother was skilled in calligraphy.

At that time Dominici no longer ruled at Fiesole. Gregory XII., in 1406 had appointed him to the Archiepiscopal See of Ragusa, at the same time elevating him to the dignity of Cardinal. His successor, in the convent of San Dominico, satisfied as to their fitness, gave a warm welcome to the two postulants. He bestowed upon them the Habit of St. Dominic, giving to the elder brother the name of Brother John, and to the younger that of Brother Benedict. They were afterwards sent to the Novitiate at Cortona, where they remained for a year, their whole time being devoted to prayer and

the practice of mortification. The whole of Fra Angelico's after life, as we gather from the records handed down to us, proves how deeply the lessons learned at the foot of the Crucifix during those months of prayer and penance sank into the Seraphic Painter's soul.

There is a touching anecdote told by Vasari, which illustrates admirably for us the exquisite simplicity of the artist monk. Long years had passed since those days when he studied the science of the Crucifix in the novitiate at Cortona. Fame had found out the gentle Brother; princes and nobles sought, as for some priceless treasure, the productions of his magic brush. Pope Nicholas, who held the humble Dominican in the highest esteem, invited him to breakfast, and, feeling pity for the toil-worn frame before him, offered him some meat, but the meek Religious humbly excused himself, while thanking His Holiness. He could not touch the proffered viands, not having his Prior's permission to eat meat. In the whole-hearted childlike simplicity of his obedience, he forgot that in the Pope, as Supreme Head of the Church, was vested all authority, and that his offer implied permission which rendered that of his Superior unnecessary. The same historian tells us further that the Angelical Painter "shunned the worldly in all things, and during his pure and simple life was such a friend to the poor that I think his soul must be bold in Heaven. He painted incessantly, but would never lay his hand to any subject not saintly. He might have had wealth, but scorned it, and used to say that true riches are to be found in contentment. He might have ruled over many, but would not, saying that obedience was easier and less liable to error. He might have enjoyed dignities among his brethren, and beyond them all; but he disdained these honours, affirming that he sought for none other than what consisted in a successful avoidance of Hell, and the attainment of Paradise. Humane, and mortified, he lived chastely, avoiding the errors of the world, and he was wont to say that the pursuit of art required peace and a life of holy thoughts; that he who illustrates the acts of Christ should live with Christ. He was never known to indulge in anger with anyone—a great, and to my mind, all but unattainable quality; and he never admonished but with a smile. With wonderful kindness he would tell those who sought his work, that if they got the consent of the Prior, he would not fail. He never retouched or altered anything he had once finished, but left it as it had turned out, considering it the Will of God that it should be so."

Beautiful is the sketch, thus drawn for us by the old art-loving historian of the Seraphic Painter. Who that ever gazed on those divine creations of his, whether as they shine forth with celestial



softness and beauty from the dim recesses of the time-worn cells of that old Monastery of St. Mark, which he adorned so lavishly with the works of his genius, or as they are revealed to us in those store-houses of Art's richest treasures, the Pitti Gallery and the Louvre; who can doubt gazing on those radiant forms that are to us as a revelation of Heaven, that such a manner of man was the sweet Monk Painter? Soft, tender, as unsullied in purity as a child, must have been the heart and mind whence emanated those matchless creations.

After the year of novitiate at Cortona, the two brothers returned to Fiesole, but, troublous times intervening, they were obliged to quit the peaceful retreat, and once more seek shelter at Cortona. It is probable that they resided there for eleven years, but nothing is known of those years spent in calm obscurity and ceaseless study.

Br. Benedict pursued the study of theology and philosophy with such brilliant success that he was later chosen as Sub-Prior of the Florentine Monastery, which office he retained for a long time. According to the Dominican ordinances, this post can only be held by preachers and theologians. His brother, the subject of our sketch, at the desire of his Superiors, did not devote much time to these studies. His brilliant genius induced them to curtail the period of preparation for the priesthood, so that he might the better devote himself to his divine art. This was the more easily done, because Dominic was an ardent lover of painting, being himself skilled in the art of illumination. In his eyes science and art were but to be used as efficacious means to spread the Gospel. Fra Angelico was to preach the Gospel by means of his brush, just as others of his Order preached it with their pens, or from the pulpit. During this sojourn at Cortona, Fra Angelico executed four paintings. The most important was painted for the Dominican Church at Cortona, and is to be seen at the present day in a chapel near the High Altar. Father Marchese regards this as one of the best work of his illustrious Brother in Religion, and other competent critics have concurred in his opinion. In this painting, one of the Frate's earliest creations, we find a work of art, perfect of its kind. It represents Our Lady seated on a throne, wearing a blue mantle, which almost entirely covers her red robe. The Divine Child seated in her lap, holds in His baby hand a damask rose. On each side are two angels bearing baskets of flowers of the most brilliant hues, whilst at the foot of the throne are bouquets of magnificent roses. In separate compartments appear the figures of St. Mary Magdalen and St. Mark, St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist. Above the central picture, in an arched frame, is Jesus crucified, with Mary and St. John. One

would never weary of gazing at this masterpiece, the colouring of which, as in all the Angelic Painter's works, is most brilliant, yet at the same time of such ethereal softness and freshness that the eye rests upon them with delight.

In 1418, the difficulties which had kept the Dominicans so long exiled from Fiesole vanished, and they were enabled to take possession once more of their beloved convent. Here our glorious Painter was to spend nearly twenty years in peaceful seclusion. Earth has few fairer views to offer than that presented from the Hill of Fiesole. Far beneath him the spectator sees the City of Flowers, with the noble dome of its majestic Cathedral lifting itself up against the glowing Italian sky; and Giotto's Tower, like some fair lily on its slender stalk, pointing heavenwards; while the Arno winds its tortuous course like a thread of silver through the valley, and, far away in the distance, loom the lofty Appennines. What visions of entrancing loveliness revealed themselves to the Seraphic Painter during those long years of blessed seclusion, as he paced the terrace of his convent home! In the early dawn, when the first faint flush in the Eastern sky announced the coming morn; in the glowing hours of noontide, when the City was veiled in a luminous haze; at the sunset hour when the evening sky was the palette whereon Nature blended her loveliest tints in such bewildering, entrancing combinations, each and every hour brought some fresh revelations of her magic tints, while her loving pupil looked on with eyes so keen to note her every loveliness, and to treasure those ravishing hues to reproduce them later for the delight of all ages. In the hushed and solemn calm of the holy night when the moon flooded the lovely valley and the olive groves on the hillsides with silver light; at all hours, in all seasons, Nature was forever unfolding, as still she unfolds, some fresh loveliness, but alas! there are no eyes touched by genius to note them now. True, it was a somewhat different city which met the gaze of Fra Angelico from what we now behold. Brunelleschi was still working at the Cathedral dome, which was not finished until 1439, while Giotto's Tower begun in 1334, was not yet completed. Before the belfrey rose the ancient Baptistry, but of its matchless doors, said by Michel Angelo to be worthy of being the doors of Heaven, Ghiberti had only begun the second in 1403, while the third was still unfinished in 1425. In the interior of the Cathedral Donatello was working in collaboration with Michelozzo at the monument erected by Cosmo Medici to the memory of John XXII., who died in 1419.

Behind the Cathedral the tower of the Signori rose proudly in the air, as if to dominate the surrounding country. Between the Duomo

and the Palazzo Vecchio was the Chapel, finished in 1412, and called Or San Michele (S. Michael in Orto). Just at this time, the facade was being adorned with a series of colossal statues, representing the patron saints of the various Guilds, magnificent works, chiselled by the famous sculptors, Donatello, Ghiberti, and Michelozzo. Within the chapel itself was erected in 1350, a splendid marble altar, surmounted by a ciborium, the work of Andrea Orcagna. From his convent at Fiesole, Fra Angelica could see, to the right, the Dominican Church of Santa Maria Novella, a building with three naves, which was begun in 1278, by his Brethren in Religion, Fra Sisto and Fra Ristoro, who were regarded in Italy, and justly so, as the best architects of their time. Many a time the monk painted must have knelt in prayer in the Chapel of the Rucellai in the same Church of this Order before Cimabue's famous Madonna, which, in 1280, was placed in that sanctuary amidst the acclamations of the people. In the ancient cloisters, were still to be seen in all their first freshness, those frescoes, now blurred and half-effaced, representing scenes from the Old Testament. In the Spanish Chapel (Capella Degli Spagnuoli) resplendent in their brilliant colouring were the frescoes of Christ's Passion, the legend of St. Dominic and of St. Peter, Martyr, as well as the Triumph of St. Thomas of Aquinas.

To the left of the Duomo, our young Painter could see Santa Croce, the magnificent Church of the Franciscans. It was begun in 1294, by Arnolfodi Cambio, but it was not until 1442 that the finishing strokes were given to the stately edifice, reared by the sons of St. Francis to the glory of God. Giotto had adorned several of the Chapels with the Coronation of the Blessed Virgin, and scenes from the lives of St. John the Baptist, St. John the Evangelist, and St. Francis. Even yet, those paintings—half effaced, and what remains, dull and retouched—charm the beholder with the beauty of their composition and the soft harmony of their colouring.

We have but little record of those twenty years passed by Fra Angelico at Fiesole. Contemplating and studying Nature in her fairest moods, communing in sweet familiarity with God and His Saints, practising the loftiest virtue in the simplest manner, in penance, and in mortification, so passed the years. God was the source whence flowed all those inspirations which took form under the peerless brush, and which thrill the beholder as if at a vision of Heaven. Gazing at those divine compositions, those heavenly forms and faces, how easy it is to believe Vasari when he tells us that.

"Fra Giovanni never took brush in hand without first, on his knees, invoking God's assistance in humblest prayer, and, when he painted a Crucifix, the tears would flow in copious streams from



his eyes. And," adds Vasari, "the saints painted by Fra Angelico have more the air of saints than those of any other master. We recognize in the faces and attitudes of his figures the depth and intensity of his faith."

The soul of Fra Angelico was pure as that of a child. He knew nothing of the passions which rend the human heart like the eruptions of a fiery volcano. He lived in an atmosphere of holiness and innocence, hence it is that his creatures are living, breathing embodiments of heavenly purity, while, when the pure-hearted monk has to paint the wicked, he invests them with ugliness so strange as to be almost grotesque. There is a painting of the Last Judgment in the Pitti Gallery, in which the ugliness of the devils and the lost souls almost provokes a smile.

Heaven's deepest calm reigned in Fra Angelico's soul. The lower depths of human sorrow and anguish were unknown to him, and hence it is that even when he depicts the Crucifixion the pain and suffering he represents have a strangely calm effect upon the beholder; those sorrow-stricken faces are so soft and sweetly heavenly that they seem to breathe forth peace and resignation like some rare flower that, when crushed, exhales the sweetest fragrance.

It was but natural that Fra Angelico should give the first fruits of his years of study to the convent at Fiesole. Upon one of the walls of the Refectory, he painted the Crucifixion with the figures of Our Blessed Lady and the Beloved Disciple. Father Marchese is of opinion that the figures of St. Dominic there represented was afterwards added. The picture was restored in 1566, and suffered considerably thereby, much of the original delicacy of the work being destroyed. During the French Revolution, the refectory was transformed into a storeroom, to the considerable damage of the painting. It was afterwards sold for 40,000 francs, removed from the wall, and taken to the Louvre.

Another fresco, painted on the wall of the Chapter Room of the convent, suffered the same fate, being purchased by a Russian noble for the sum of 46,000 francs. Although this picture has also suffered at the hands of the "restorers," it may still be classed amongst the best of the master's works. The Divine Infant is represented standing on His Mother's lap, while at the side are St. Dominic and St. Thomas Aquinas holding an open book. In none of Fra Angelico's paintings are the faces and form more divinely beautiful. Unfortunately some of the draperies and the lower part of the picture have suffered from damp and unskillful retouching.

The "Coronation of the Blessed Virgin," also painted for the Fiesole Convent, was removed in 1812, and is now in the Louvre.

The picture painted for the High Altar is now in the National Gallery, London. Its place in the Church at Fiesole is occupied by a bad copy.

In 1436, Fra Angelico painted, for one of the Florentine Guilds, his famous Madonna with angel musicians; at the same time he finished three pictures for the Cistercians in Florence. But his principal work of that time was the Descent from the Cross, painted for the Church of the Trinita, Florence, and now in the Academia delle Belle Arti in that City. In this marvellous painting, we see the Sacred Body of Our Divine Lord bearing upon it all the marks of the terrible sufferings inflicted upon it, but yet retaining all its Divine Majesty and Beauty. As it lightly rests on the arms of Nicodemus, the Sacred Limbs seem scarcely to have any of the rigidity of Death. The Sacred Feet reach downwards to Mary Magdalen, who kneels with out-stretched hands covered with a transparent veil to receive them, whilst she bows her head in lowliest adoration; Joseph of Arimathea stands on a ladder opposite Nicodemus. He still retains hold of one Divine Arm, whilst Saint John sustains the weight of the Beloved Master's Sacred Body, still lower down, we see the kneeling figure of a young man wearing a crown, who seems as he strikes his breast, to accuse himself as the cause of his Saviour's death. The forms of two other men are visible between Magdalen and Joseph of Arimathea, as they support from behind the Sacred Body in such a manner as to assist John and Nicodemus, and to allow the Precious Burden to sink gently to the ground. On the right of the picture the Holy Women are grouped. Mary, with out-stretched hand, awaits the moment when the mangled remains of Her Divine Son shall be laid upon her lap. She is seated on a slight elevation of the ground, whilst the others stand respectfully around; two women hold the winding sheet.

In this lovely picture the master has chosen his colours with the greatest care, and their harmony is perfect; Magdalen and the man who stands opposite her are robed in red. The amber reflections, verging on brown, cast by the Sacred Body, harmonize perfectly with Magdalen's robe. Saint John and the two men whose figures appear between Magdalen and Joseph of Arimathea, are vested in blue. The garment worn by Nicodemus and also Joseph's under vestment are of a delicate purple. The upper tunic of the last-named is deep green, thus completing the perfect harmony of the colouring.

Regarding this masterpiece, Montalembert says, "Oh! what superabounding love of God; what immense and ardent contrition must the saintly Fra Angelico have experienced when painting this Cruci-

fixion. How he must have meditated in his narrow cell, and wept over the sufferings of Our Divine Master. Every touch of the brush, every detail, seem so many loving regrets coming from the depths of his soul. What a touching sermon is preached by such a picture! Others may only see therein a work of art, but I feel that I derive therefrom ineffable consolation and profound instruction."

## II.

In the year 1436 Fra Angelico quitted Fiesole to take up his abode in the Convent of St. Mark in Florence. The latter convent was but recently rebuilt by Cosmo de Medici. This powerful Prince who owned a villa near the convent at Fiesole, had constituted himself the patron of the religious who dwelt there. Ever the munificent patron of Art, he soon discovered the rare genius of the lowly Dominican. At his request, Fra Angelico had painted several pictures for him, and it was now, through his solicitations that the Angelic Painter was transferred to the newly restored Convent of St. Mark.

Cosmo de Medici had entrusted the task of rebuilding the Convent to Michelozzi but St. Antoninus modified the prince's magnificent designs as being opposed to the spirit of the Dominican Order. Hence, resulted a building of noble yet simple architecture. Only in the construction of the two cloisters and of the library did the genius of Michelozzi find full sway. The library is divided into three naves by two rows of magnificent Doric pillars.

When the monks of Fiesole entered St. Mark, nothing but bare whitewashed walls met their gaze, a particularly repellant sight to the beauty-loving Italian, but not long did they so remain. Those smooth walls afforded boundless opportunity for the exercise of the Angelic Painter's divine talent.

At the end of the outer cloister, called the Cloister of St. Antoninus, because of a series of frescoes on its walls, representing scenes from the life of the holy Archbishop of Florence which were executed at the close of the sixteenth century, a beautiful "Christ on the Cross" is seen. The Divine figure, hanging on the Cross is painted with the artist's tender matchless skill. St. Dominic kneels below, clasping the foot of the Cross in his loving embrace, whilst he gazes with eyes full of sorrowing love on his crucified Master. All art critics are unanimous in praising this work, which is, notwithstanding, of the utmost simplicity. The figures are but few, and it lacks brilliant colouring, but yet what lessons does that picture preach. What profound self-abnegation; what utter oblivion of all save Christ Crucified in that rapt figure of St. Dominic, as he con-



templates with eyes from which his love-filled soul shines forth, the bleeding mangled form of his Redeemer! What lessons in prayer and meditation for the white-robed sons of St. Dominic, as they stood in the silent cloister before the ecstatic figure of their Founder! There was their standard, there the principles, the life and soul of their Order, self-immolation at the foot of the Cross; forgetfulness of everything, save Jesus Crucified. Eloquent is the sermon, indeed which Fra Angelico preaches still by the might of his genius, from that old Convent wall.

Not far from this painting, and over the door leading to the sacristy is a painting of St. Peter, Martyr, holding in his left hand a book and a palm-branch, whilst, with the forefinger of his right hand placed on his lips, he enjoins silence. An eloquent reminder to the Brethren of the silence and recollection which should reign in the cloisters. Near the door leading to the refectory is a representation of Our Lord, standing erect in His Tomb, and showing His pierced hands. Nowhere has Fra Angelico painted face and form of diviner beauty. Over another door (that of the guest-room of the monastery) the same masterhand has depicted two Dominicans receiving Our Divine Lord Himself under the guise of a pilgrim. The two religious are receiving their guest, represented as a beautiful young man, with countenances which beam with heavenly charity. Over the refectory, Fra Benedetto (our Painter's brother) has represented the scene of Emmaus, but his work is far inferior to that of Fra Angelico. A beautiful figure of St. Thomas Aquinas, alas! much damaged, completes the decoration of the cloister.

In the Chapter-room of the Convent is the great picture of the Crucifixion, usually regarded as the Angelic Painter's greatest work. The Divine Redeemer hangs from a Cross of great height, whence he dominates the whole world; on each side hang the two thieves. At the foot of the Cross a death's head indicates the consequences of sin. Grouped around are the faithful few who have followed the Master to Calvary. Our Lady, fainting beneath the load of sorrow, is supported by one of the holy women, while Magdalen, kneeling at the foot of the Cross, turns round to receive in her arms the Mother of God. This group is of divinest beauty. A little apart, we see St. John the Baptist, St. Mark, the patron of the Convent, Saint Laurence, Saints Cosmas and Damian, the two last being the patrons of the Medici family; on the opposite side is Saint Dominic in an ecstasy of sorrow, Saint Thomas of Aquin, and a number of other saints. It would be impossible to give an idea of the marvellous skill with which the painter had depicted on each face the varying expressions of tenderest love and agonising sorrow.

It is much to be regretted that partial attempts at restoration have seriously injured this magnificent work, by destroying the delicate harmony of its tones, replacing the original blue of the background by a shade of red, hurtful to the eye.

In addition to the Crucifixion in the Chapter Room, Fra Angelico painted another in the Refectory, but this last was destroyed in 1434. The Crucifixion was pre-eminently the Angelic Painter's favourite subject. It is repeated seventeen times in the cells of St. Mark's Monastery. On the bare walls of these narrow cells Fra Angelico has left visions of beauty, entrancing the beholder, even now after the long ages which have passed into Eternity, since the Painter's magic brush gave life and colour to those exquisite creations. What a revelation of the Artist's humility! No thought of earthly fame or of the applause of admiring crowds crossed the mind of the humble monk, as he lavished the treasures of his genius on these bare narrow cells where there was scarcely space for a table, a chair, and the couch whereon the mortified Religious snatched a few brief hours of slumber. The strict convent enclosure forbade all such dreams, but Fra Angelico worked for the glory of God and the sanctification of souls, carrying out those great aims of his Order as effectually in his silent cloister as the preacher or the missionary.

On the outer wall of the row of cells, Fra Angelico has depicted the Annunciation with surpassing grace and purity. The Blessed Virgin is represented seated on a small stool, while the Angel kneels before her. The small cell opens on a portico, and beyond we see a closed garden, glowing with beautiful flowers; Underneath the painting the saintly artist has written, "Hail, Mother of Love; Mary the august temple of the Holy Trinity," and then he adds, "When you pass before the picture of the Immaculate Virgin, remember, as you pass, to say an Ave."

In one of the cells there is another Annunciation of even **more** celestial loveliness. Our Lady is kneeling; the Angel stands before her and seems to await her reply. Behind him is St. Peter the Martyr so distinguished for his purity. Words fail to do justice to this exquisite fresco. In one of the cells, larger than the others there is a beautiful Adoration of the Magi. Cosmo de Medici had this cell built for himself, and thither he frequently came to pass a few days in the company of the Prior, Saint Antoninus, and our Painter, for whom he entertained great affection. Pope Eugene IV. also occupied this cell on the occasion of his visit to Florence in 1442, for the purpose of presiding at the ceremony of the consecration of St. Mark.

The Adoration of the Magi was a favourite subject with the paint-

ers of the Renaissance on account of the scope it afforded for rich costumes and flowing draperies. In choosing it for the decoration of the cell occupied by the rich and mighty Medici Prince, doubtless Fra Angelico meant to inculcate the lesson that the great ones of earth should lay their sceptres and their riches at the Feet of Jesus Christ. The scene is admirably arranged. In the background are the mountains of Judea, which the three kings have crossed. The side of a wall indicates the cave of Bethlehem. Our Lady is seated on the saddle of an ass, holding on her lap the Divine Child, who blesses the old king, while the latter, prostrate before Him, scarcely dares to kiss the feet of the Desired of all nations. He has just offered his gift, which St. Joseph, who is standing near, holds in his hand. Behind are the two other kings and their suite, composed of warriors and wise men, in oriental costumes. One of the kings holds a sphere to indicate the science, the pursuit of which has led them to the New-born Saviour. Two men on horseback are gazing at the star just over the stable. The whole design is masterly in its conception and treatment.

In another cell there is an exquisite "Coronation of the Virgin." This subject was very dear to Fra Angelico, and he has treated it here with the full perfection of his genius. Our Divine Lord and His Immaculate Mother are represented seated on light clouds; Our Lady bends humbly, while her Divine Son places on her head a radiant crown, her whole attitude seems to suggest that she is once more repeating, "Behold the Hand-maid of the Lord." Both figures are clothed in robes of dazzling whiteness. Around are grouped numerous saints in adoring ecstasy.

As we wander through these silent deserted cells, once the abode of sanctity and learning, and gaze in mute admiration on the forms and faces which gleam from the bare walls like soft glimpses of celestial regions, many are the thoughts suggested of the two mighty spirits who lived and moved such long centuries ago, within those cloisters; each so different in his giant intellect, and yet each striving for the same end. The stern reformer, Savonarola, and the gentle brother, the Angelic Painter. The fiery Champion of God's honour, who fearlessly denounced sin, and the saintly artist who, in the depth of his cloister, preached and still preaches sublime lessons in the Science of Salvation.

The saintly Dominican artist was not to end his days in the Convent of St. Mark, upon the decoration of which he had been so prodigal of his brilliant talent, nor yet, was he to die in the peaceful calm of fair Fiesole, the scene of his early religious life.

In 1445, Pope Eugenius IV. summoned Fra Angelico to Rome,



and there he passed the last ten years of his life. The Pope had already conceived a great regard for the Angelic Painter during his stay in the Convent of St. Mark.

In 1445, Zabarella, the Archbishop of Florence died, and some historians, amongst them Vasari, tell us that the Pope wished to nominate Fra Angelico to the vacant See. In reality, Antoninus, the Prior of St. Mark, was the one upon whom the Pope's choice fell. In connection with his election, Vasari tells the following story, amusing in its quaint simplicity:—

"The Pope, knowing Fra Giovanni as a man of most holy life, gentle and humble, judged him worthy to fill the Archiepiscopal See of Florence, just then vacant. When the humble Religious heard the news, he besought the Holy Father to choose another, alleging that he felt himself utterly unfit to govern others, and then the simple-minded monk went on to inform the Pope that in his Order there was a brother, ardently devoted to the poor, most learned; who understood how to rule, and filled with the fear of the Lord. Far better would it be that His Holiness should elect such a man."

The Pope, we are told, recognised the wisdom of the humble Friar's remarks, and acting on his advice, nominated Antoninus Archbishop of Florence. This illustrious member of the Dominican Order, famous alike for his learning and his sanctity, was canonised in the reign of Pope Adrian VI.

Possibly this story, told by Vasari, has but little foundation. Be that as it may, the fact remains that Fra Angelico was called to Rome in 1445, and took up his abode in the Convent of His Order, Santa Maria Sopra Minerva. He had the happiness of enjoying the friendship of two of the greatest Pontiffs who ever sat in the Chair of Peter.

Eugenius IV., whose mission it was to restore discipline and heal the wounds which schism had inflicted on the Church, was a man of the most exalted virtue, and endowed with the rarest gifts. Noble by birth and possessed of great fortune, he might have aspired to earth's highest honours, but he fled from the world to a convent in Venice, having first distributed his fortune amongst the poor. When raised to the Pontifical Throne, he proved himself the devoted friend of the poor and an apostle full of zeal for God's Church.

Very touching is the account of the last hours of the great Pope. On Christmas Day, after celebrating Mass, he was seized with sudden illness, and at once announced to those around that his death was at hand. He summoned Saint Antoninus to his bedside, and received from him the last Sacraments. The Saint spoke at length to the dying Pontiff on the joys of Heaven into which he was about to enter. Just as the words with which the Church speeds the soul about to set forth on the journey to eternity, "Depart, O Christian Soul," were being pronounced the saintly Pontiff calmly expired.

The conclave summoned to elect his successor met in the Dominican Church of the Minerva, and thus it happened that our Angelic Painter was one of the first who rendered homage to the new Pope, the Cardinal Archbishop of Bologna, who was elected under the title of Nicholas V. This Pope was a most liberal patron of the fine arts, and did much towards beautifying Rome. His sincere affection for Fra Angelico lasted until the death of the latter, and it was he who wrote the epitaph engraved on the great Painter's tomb.

Amongst the fruits of Fra Angelico's labours during those last years passed in the Eternal City, were the mural decorations of two chapels in the Vatican. One, the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, was demolished in the reign of Paul III., to allow the erection of the staircase leading to the Sistine Chapel. The other chapel, known as the Chapel of Nicholas V., has fortunately been preserved. It is small and lighted by a window. On three sides are represented the scenes from the lives of St. Stephen the Martyr and Saint Laurence. These compositions are, even amongst the master's works, remarkable for the beauty of their design and the purity and brilliancy of their colouring.

In 1447, an appeal was made to the great Dominican artist, by the people of Orvieto, that he would decorate one of the chapels of their noble Cathedral, of which the first stone was laid in 1290.

The origin of the building of this Cathedral is very remarkable. A priest, who doubted of the Real Presence, was one day terrified while saying Mass, to behold the Corporal dyed with Blood. God had lifted the veil which hides His Divine Presence from our mortal eyes, and allowed the Precious Blood to flow visibly as on Calvary.

The people witnesses of this stupendous miracle, resolved to erect a shrine, magnificent as their greatest efforts could make it, for the reception of the Blood-stained Corporal. Thus it is that the vast Basilica of Orvieto, with all its marvels of painting and sculpture, its stained glass, and gorgeous gem-studded reliquary, is a people's act of faith in the Real Presence.

Fra Angelico accepted the invitation to Orvieto, and we find him during the months of June, July, and August, working at the decoration of one of the chapels in the Cathedral. The subject he had chosen was the Last Judgment, a subject which he had already treated with consummate skill. In September he returned to Rome, leaving his work unfinished. During these three months he painted Christ, surrounded by the Prophets, with Hell yawning beneath. In one hand the Divine Saviour holds a globe, emblematic of the world, whilst the other is raised in malediction against the damned. From this fragment we may form some idea of what the entire com-

position would have been if carried out. Nothing similar was ever attempted by the painters of the period, and those figures will remain to all times as models of religious painting.

Fra Angelico did not return to Orvieto, for what reasons we know not, although the people never ceased to hope for his return until that last moment, when "Envious Death dashed from him his brush," thus rendering hope impossible.

Amidst the magnificent tombs, which adorn the Church of the Minerva, may be seen in the sacristy a simple monumental stone on which is represented a Religious sleeping the sleep of the just. This stone marks the spot where rests Fra Angelico of Fiesole. He died on the 18th March, 1445, in the sixty-eighth year of his age. There is no record left to us of his last moments, but who can doubt but that this pure angelic soul passed in happy ecstasy to Heaven. There were no gloomy remorseful memories to rise from the past to disturb the peace of his last moments. From early youth Fra Angelico had been consecrated to God's service. The marvellous gift which God had bestowed upon him had never been used save for his Divine Master's Glory and the salvation of souls. May we not feel certain that when, according to the beautiful custom of their Order, his brethren gathered round his dying bed to chant the *Salve Regina*, the Queen of Heaven graciously hearkened to their prayer? She who had been the light, the sweetness of his life, whose sweet image he had never wearied reproducing, would she not now turn her loving eyes on her faithful client, and show unto him the Blessed Fruit of her womb? And, so surrounded by rejoicing angels, the pure soul of the Angelic Painter passed from earth.

The humble Dominican's death evoked universal regret. The Pope, as we have said, composed the epitaph for his tomb. The people, who revered him as a saint, bestowed upon him the title of *Il Beato*. The gentle Brother who, during his life shrank from earthly fame or glory, will live to all time in the hearts and on the lips of men, winning, by means of his heavenly creations, souls to the love of God; even the most worldly-minded, as they gaze on his immortal works, feeling their hearts strangely stirred with yearning after better things.

In the Uffizi Gallery, Florence, there is an exquisite Coronation of the Blessed Virgin, painted by Fra Angelico, for the Church of the Carthusians, near Florence. In this masterpiece are represented no less than forty angels, robed in garments of dazzling brightness, glittering with gold embroidery. Next to Our Divine Lord and His Immaculate Mother, Fra Angelico loved to paint the angelic inhabitants of Heaven. Never does his genius shine more transcendantly



than when thus employed. Those radiant figures full of celestial grace and beauty, breathing of Eternal youth, are indeed angels. We feel instinctively that those peerless forms are beings far removed from us. No wonder that Vasari should exclaim that the man who painted such must have first seen them in Heaven. In this picture Our Lord is represented bending over His Blessed Mother. His right hand is raised to insert one last gem in the radiant diadem with which she is already crowned. Besides, the rejoicing angels, we see a large number of the elect, amongst whom are St. Peter, St. Dominic, and St. Benedict on one side; on the other, St. Mary Magdalen, St. Catherine, St. Stephen and St. Peter, Martyr. The harmony of the colouring in this work is perfect, and the beauty of the whole is indescribable.

Amongst the most precious of the treasures in the National Gallery, London, is a picture executed by Fra Angelico for the Dominican Church at Fiesole. The painting is divided into three compartments; in the centre Our Divine Saviour is represented ascending gloriously to Heaven, in His hand the victorious standard of the Resurrection; a multitude of adoring angels surround Him, and announce His victory to the whole world with the sound of trumpets and other musical instruments; in the two side compartments a great number of saints are seen, all sharing in the glory of the Redeemer's triumph over the powers of darkness. Celestial beauty and sweetness breathe from this inspired composition.

Truly do we feel as we gaze on these creations of his genius that the Divine Painter is not dead, but still lives and preaches to all men the Beauty of Holiness.

E. LEAHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

---

#### WHEN DID ISRAEL GO OUT OF EGYPT?

WE have many decisive proofs of the existence of other nations in the remote ages of antiquity, as powerful as the Egyptians, and even more enlightened. Yet, of those nations, no vestige remains; their buildings, and other public works are totally effaced. The country which they cultivated and embellished, is, at present, a barren desert, destitute of every remain that might mark its ancient state, and inhabited, or rather ravaged, by wandering barbarians." Thus wrote Karsten Niebuhr in 1792.<sup>1</sup> Since then great changes have been operated in the world of historical investigation, floods of light have poured in upon us from the

---

<sup>1</sup> Travels through Arabia.

East, and the deserts have surrendered many of their secrets. Long buried civilizations live again, and people of the most remote ages rise up from the mists of fable, assuming the shape of real and tangible history. The progress made, since Grotefend and Rawlinson began the deciphering of the cuneiform inscriptions is enormous. Egypt and Babylonia have both grown to be inexhaustible treasures to the archaeologist, and consequently, to the historian. It has become possible to reconstruct the history of the Land of the Nile, as well as that of the Euphrates valley. Not the least interest in the discoveries made is the light, direct or indirect, which has been cast upon our Sacred Writings, and we look forward with pleasure to the day, still remote, when out of the dead past, the sun will rise, to cast its brilliancy over points still obscure.

There are few questions so near to the heart of the Biblical student, and, perhaps, of the Egyptologist, as the date of the Exodus in Egyptian history. Strong authorities have placed this cardinal event of Israelite history in the reign of Merneptah, successor to the second Ramesses, and in favor of this opinion, many illustrious names might be cited. This belief, though quite common until recently, has not been without its adversaries. As early as 1840, Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson regarded Thothmes III. of the XVIII Dynasty, as the Pharaoh of the Exodus.<sup>2</sup> Captain A. E. Haynes, R. E., writes that "it is possible to show, that the evidence daily accruing, points with peculiar and increasing persistency, to one period of Egyptian chronology, as the period in question, in preference to the other (the times of the XIX Dynasty)."<sup>3</sup>

The arguments in favor of the reign of Merneptah may be briefly summed up. In 1881, Maspero and Emil Brugsch discovered, among others the mummy of Ramesses II, in the rock-pit between the mounds of Shaikh Abd el Qurnah, and the Temple of Der-el-Bahri. This great conqueror of Western Asia had reigned in Egypt sixty-seven years. One of the store cities built for Pharaoh by the Israelites, bore the name of Rameses, or Ramesses (Exod. I, 11.). This fact appeared to be a sufficient reason to identify the great man who bore this name with the Pharaoh of the oppression, as no ruler is known to have borne it before the XIX Dynasty. The other city constructed by the Hebrews was Pithom. The site of this city has been identified by M. Nairlle, in the mound of Tel-el-Maskhuta, where bricks and inscriptions were found, showing that there had existed the city of Per-Tum, the city of Tum, or Tmu, the God of the Setting Sun. The name of Ramesses II. frequently recurring, led

---

<sup>2</sup> The Ancient Egyptians. Vol. I., p. 52.

<sup>3</sup> Quarterly Statement. Palestine Exploration Fund, 1896.

to the conclusion that the city was founded by him. The Egyptian name of the district in which Pithon, or Per-Tum, lay, was called Th'ukut which corresponds to the Soccoth of Exodus (XII, 37.) It is also remarkable that the walls which divided the compartments of the storehouses were found to be made of bricks without straw. "Therefore he commanded the same day the overseers of the works and the taskmasters of the people: you shall give straw no more to the people to make brick, as before, but let them go, and gather straw." (Exod. V. 6, 7.). Another argument may be drawn from the length of Ramesses' reign of sixty-seven years. He was ninety years of age, when he died. We know from the Bible, that the Pharaoh of the oppression had a long reign. "Now, after a long time, the King of Egypt died." (Exod. II. 23.).

If Ramesses II. was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, it has been inferred, that his son and successor, Merneptah, must be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The Book of Exodus leads us to believe that this Pharaoh was a man of weak and vacillating character. Whenever the plagues afflict him, and evils gather round him, he takes the place of a suppliant. No sooner, however, has the danger passed, than he hardens his heart, returning to his evil ways, and cruel persecution. From the monuments, we know comparatively little of Merneptah's life, and this alone places him in striking contrast with his great father, Ramesses, whose memory has remained crystalized in stone by the commemoration of his victories on the walls of the great temple of Karnak. In Merneptah's reign, Egypt was weakened and it no longer inspired the terror, connected with the name of Ramesses. An inscription on the temple of Ammon at Thebes allows us, moreover, to conjecture that Merneptah was regarded as pusillanimous. "Put away the dejected heart from thee," was the admonition given to him.<sup>4</sup> The funeral temple of Merneptah at Thebes was explored, in 1896, by Petrie, who discovered there a statue of the king, and an inscribed stele of his reign. The face bears the impress of softness and effeminacy, so different from the energetic features of Ramesses II. Upon the stele in question, mention is made of the Israelites. The inscription has thus been translated: "The Israelites (I-s-i-r-a-e-ru) are ruined (lost); their crops are destroyed."<sup>5</sup>

About 1899, Loret found in his tomb the mummy of Amenophis II. Here too, with others, was discovered that of Merneptah, son of Ramesses II. This fact does not, in reality, militate against the

<sup>4</sup>Light from the East. C. T. Ball.

<sup>5</sup>For other arguments in favor of Merneptah's being the Pharaoh of the Exodus, see "The Pharaoh of the Exodus and his son," by John A. Paine in the *Century Magazine*, September 1889, p. 708.



theory of his having been the Pharaoh of the Exodus; for it is not stated that Pharaoh himself was drowned with his army in the Red Sea, or, even if he had been drowned, his body would surely have been recovered, if possible. That the possibility existed, is evident from Exod. XIV, 31, where we are told, that the dead bodies might be seen upon the seashore, after the catastrophe. From the foregoing, we may conclude, that there are arguments in favor of the opinion of Merneptah being the Pharaoh of the Exodus, which are not to be despised. The strongest of these is the identification of the cities of Pithom, and the name of the city of Ramesses.

We may now turn our attention to tradition. One fact must be regarded as certain, and that is that the persecutors of the Hebrews belonged to a dynasty, different from that, under which Jacob had entered Egypt. The king "that knew not Joseph" was not likely to be of the family of the Pharaoh who had raised him to the most exalted position in the land. Josephus says that the persecutors of the Hebrews belonged to a family, distinct from that, under which Jacob and his children went to Egypt.<sup>6</sup> It has generally been believed that Joseph was sold into Egypt during the period, a very obscure period, of Hyksos domination. One of the Hyksos kings, according to Manetho, cited by Josephus, was Ianias.<sup>7</sup> The Arab list of Egyptian kings gives us, among the Amalekites who had conquered Egypt, Reijan, and an old Arab tradition, extant in Egypt makes Reijan, son of El Welid, the Pharaoh of Joseph. In 1888, Naville discovered the statue of Ian, the cartouche of whom styles him the "Son of Ra," and who, as an Arab said, had been known as the Pharaoh of Joseph.<sup>8</sup> This Reijan should, therefore, be identified with the Ianias of Manetho, the Ian-Ra of the discovery of Naville, and Khian, the best known king of the Hyksos.<sup>9</sup> The Arabs make Walid, grandson of Reijan, in the same dynasty, the Pharaoh of the Exodus.<sup>10</sup>

In Manetho's dynasties, as given by Africanus, we find Amosis the first king of the XVIII Dynasty. This agrees with the monuments, for which Aahmes is the first monarch of the same dynasty. According to Africanus, the Exodus occurred in the reign of this monarch. The Manetho lists in Eusebius place the same event under Chencherres, several reigns later, but in the same dynasty. This Chencherres must be the same as the one named in Africanus,

---

<sup>6</sup> Antiquitates, Book II, IX. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Contra Apionem, bb. I, 14.

<sup>8</sup> The Bible and Modern Discoveries. Henry A. Harper, 1891.

<sup>9</sup> Breasted's "History of Egypt," p. 221.

<sup>10</sup> Sayce, "The Ancient Empires of the East," p. 282.

According to Georgios Syncellos, Joseph was in Egypt in the reign of Apophis, one of the Hyksite Kings.

Akherres, and by Eusebins, elsewhere Abhenkherres, Abencherres, Sayce identifies him with Amenhotep III. Tradition points, then, evidently to the fact that the Jews left Egypt under the dynasty that immediately followed the expulsion of the Hyksos, that is the eighteenth.

A word on this mysterious race may not be out of place here. We know from Exodus (XIV, 9.) that Paraoh's army contained many chariots and horses, and it is also known, that the horse was introduced into Egypt by the Hyksos. It may not be impossible at some future day, to identify the Hyksos with the Hittites, that mysterious people that have left us their, thus far, undeciphered monuments. It is a remarkable fact, that the prominent God of the Vheta (Hittites) was Sutekh, and that the Hyksos, also honored Sutekh, the son of Nut, as the supreme god of their country.<sup>11</sup> It is, at least, not at all improbable that the leaders of the Hyksos were Hittite princes. Their features, as revealed by their scanty monuments, belong to a very peculiar and non-Semitic type.<sup>12</sup> The period of Hyksos domination is quite uncertain as to its duration, some extending it to more than 500, and others limiting it to less than 200 years. If there is a foundation in the traditions, to which we have referred, and we must look for the Exodus in the eighteenth dynasty, we should have to put that event, at the latest, about 1450 B. C. Allowing the full period of 430 years for the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, contrary to a current opinion among Biblical scholars and beginning that period with the entrance of Jacob into Egypt, we should find the Hyksos firmly established in the land in 1880 B. C. We should also conclude, that they had been there for a considerable period, for the rulers of Egypt, in Joseph's time were entirely Egyptian in manners, as well as in language. There are two ways of avoiding the chronological difficulties that would present themselves. One would be to limit the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt to little more than 200 years, as is generally done, or place the entrance of Joseph into Egypt in the XIIth Dynasty. The latter mode of procedure would be in contradiction with the tradition, that makes one of the Hyksos kings the Paraoh of Joseph. The former would be based upon very solid grounds, and it would harmonize better with Egyptian chronology, by allowing us to limit the period of Hyksos domination. On the other hand, it would render it very difficult to make Abraham a contemporary of Hammurabi, as some Assyriologists have done, and as the names of the kings in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis would incline us to do. The opinion

<sup>11</sup> Brugsch Broderick, *Egypt, etc.*, p. 108, 284.

<sup>12</sup> Sayce. *The Ancient Empires of the East*, p. 22.

giving 430 years to the Israelites in Egypt would agree better with the Hebrew text.

In Gen. XV, 13, God says to Abraham: "Know thou beforehand that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land not their own, and that they shall bring them under bondage, and afflict them four hundred years." The four hundred years may either apply only to the words "shall be a stranger in a land," or they may have reference to "they shall bring them under bondage, and afflict them." In the latter hypothesis, we should infer, that the Hyksos were expelled, soon after the death of Joseph, when, the Israelites, foreigners as they were and friends of the hated Hyksos race fell under the ban of persecution. The four hundred years, it is clear, must be taken as a round number. At all events, the text gives no occasion to include as some have done, the whole of Jacob's life, and, also, the wandering in the desert, or, with others, to begin the 430 years, with the vocation of Abraham, unless we admit, that the Lord intended to begin the period with the covenant He was about to make, for which there does not appear to be sufficient ground from the text itself.

Further, in Exodus XII, 40, it is said: "And the abode of the children of Israel that they made in Egypt, was four hundred thirty years." The complete period of 430 years would afford more time to explain the great increase of the Hebrews who, as Loch and Reischl assume, numbered about three millions, when they left Egypt.

On the other hand, the opinion limiting the abode of Israel in Egypt appears to be more in accord with Hebrew tradition. The LXX interpreters may first be cited as an argument. In the Greek version we read: "The abode of the children of Israel that they abode, they *and their fathers*, in the land of Egypt and *Chanaan* was four hundred and thirty years."<sup>13</sup>

Jewish tradition, at the time of Josephus, when the LXX was extensively used, seems to favor the opinion there expressed, for the author of the "*Antiquitates*" makes the sojourn in Egypt 205 years. St. Paul also, might be cited in this sense. In Galatians III, 17, the Apostle would appear to make the 430 years begin with the covenant, established by God with Abraham.

If then we place the Exodus in 1450 B. C., 215 years earlier would bring us to 1665 B. C., more than a hundred years after the close of the XIIth Dynasty, and quite easily, within the period of the supremacy of the Hyksos princes who reigned in Egypt in the north, while, it is altogether probable the old native monarchs con-

<sup>13</sup> See Heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments nach der Vulgata, by Dr. Wilhelm Reischl. *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, by Schoupe, vol. I., p. 147, A. Lapide, *Exod.* XII., 40.



tinued to rule in the south, at least during a portion of the time. One generation would have sufficed for the conquerors to adopt the language of the civilized inhabitants, of the land they had made their own, and thus Joseph might have found the Hyksos court at Tanis, to all intents and purposes thoroughly Egyptian.

Joseph himself had acquired the language of the country when his father arrived in Egypt (Gen. LXII, 23). The Hyksos kings had adopted the old title of Pharaoh, together with other Egyptian institutions, as well as the religion of their subjects. The old Egyptian god Ra was in honor among them, and the venerable priesthood of Heliopolis retained its prestige. It was in this Joseph married. "And he turned his name, and called him in the Egyptian tongue, the Saviour of the World. And he gave him to wife Aseneth, the daughter of Putiphare priest of Heliopolis." (Gen. XLI. 45). Aseneth was the mother of his two sons, Manasses and Ephraim.

The dignity of Joseph was, probably, that of chief minister, or vizier to the Pharaoh, a dignity entirely in accordance with Egyptian customs. We now return to the monuments. Thotmes, or Tahutimes III. was the greatest king of the XVIII. dynasty; his reign lasted fifty four years, during which time, he established his sovereignty over the petty principalities of Canaan and Aram, and extended his dominions into Mesopotamia. The inscriptions on the temple of Karnak exhibit him as a great conqueror, and among the conquered peoples of Palestine in his reign, we find the names of Jacob-el and Joseph-el, a fact I will not undertake to explain. He employed foreign captives to build the temple of Ammon at Thebes, and a store house of the god Ammon in the same city was erected in his reign. The character of this king, and the length of his reign would lead us to compare him to Ramesses II.

Thotmes III., was succeeded by his son, Amenhotep II., whom Captain Haynes regards as the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Then followed Thotmes IV., Amenhotep III., and Amenhotep IV, Ikhnaton, or Khuen-Aten.

The relations between these two last sovereigns, and the land of Canaan are made clear to us by the Tel-el-Amarna letters, discovered in 1885. They show us the country in a state of unrest and disintegration, while Egyptian rule had been weakened and enemies were pressing hard on all sides, the Hittites from the north, and the Khabiri from the region of the desert. The Palestinian princes are earnest in their appeal to their Egyptian lord for assistance. If the Exodus belongs to the reign of Amenhotep II., we should look for the entrance of the children of Israel into Egypt about this period.

At this juncture, it becomes necessary to invoke the aid of chronology. Egyptian, like Babylonian chronology, presents to the student numberless embarrassments, owing to the tremendous discrepancies among the savants. The day has not yet arrived, when we may speak with any degree of certainty regarding the time of events in the second millennium before Christ. *Ramesses II.* is generally located somewhere in the XIII. or XIV century.<sup>14</sup> Over and against this contradictory Egyptian chronology, we possess a most venerable time-reckoning which, in spite of what its critics, among Catholics and Protestants alike, may say, deserves, at least, as much credit as that based upon the uncertain statements found on Egyptian monuments, or Babylonian tablets. It is indeed, strange, that those who place such implicit faith in the monuments of antiquity should instinctively hesitate when there is question of a venerable compilation of documents which has commanded the respect of thousands of years. Although the Holy Scriptures were never intended to teach chronology, yet, beginning with the *Exodus*, there runs through the Bible a well defined and generally consequent system of dates, the sequence of which forces itself upon the mind of an attentive student. The true Jewish chronology, says Julius Oppert, begins with the *Exodus*.<sup>15</sup> Speaking of the *Book of Kings*, the same distinguished scholar writes that we are not permitted to thrust aside such an entirely historical chronology, for the sake of misunderstood cuneiform texts.<sup>16</sup>

Wherever, he adds, we find in the *Book of Kings*, an apparent contradiction of dates, we may be sure that there is a falsification of the text which has been long since acknowledged.

This discrepancy of texts has long been observed, nor did it escape the notice of St. Jerome. The difference between the reckoning of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, may be explained, according to Father Cornely, by the falsification of texts, or it may be by possible interregna.<sup>17</sup>

In order to establish satisfactorily the date of the *Exodus*, it becomes necessary to fix with certainty some other event in Jewish

<sup>14</sup> I subjoin a few authorities: Hoka's *Manuel, d'Histoire, de Genealogical de Chronologic*—places him between 1406, 1340 B. C. Wilkinson puts him erroneously in the XVIII. Dynasty between 1355-1289. Pastor, *The Early History of Syria and Palestine*—following Lehmann and Steindorff, gives us the period 1347-1258, as that of the reign of *Ramesses*. Petrie gives the approximate date 1257 for *Ramesses II.* Breasted, in his "*History of Egypt*," one of the latest authorities, places *Ramesses II.*, between 1292 and 1225 B. C.

<sup>15</sup> *La Chronologie de la Genese* in the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, No. 31, 1895.

<sup>16</sup> *Die Biblische Chronologie, festgeschellt nach den Assy. Keilschriften, in die Zietschrift de, Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft.* XXIII, 1869.

<sup>17</sup> *Historica et Critica Introductio in V. T. libros sacros.*

history, as a starting point. The one most convenient, and most central, is that connected with the erection of Solomon's temple. This date may be most conveniently settled by having recourse to the synchronism of Jewish and Profane history. Unfortunately, however, we do not find at this time any date upon which all agree within a period of fifty years. If, with what seems to be the common opinion, we accept the Assyrian Eponym Canon<sup>18</sup> as an unbroken succession, we lose fifty years and are carried forward that length of time toward the birth of Christ. If, on the other hand, we agree with the late Dr. Oppert, and admit an interruption of the canon, we gain the same length of time, and are carried away from the first year of the Christian era.

Looking around for an event from which we may proceed, two Assyrian monuments come to our assistance, one the black obelisk of Shalmaneser III., discovered at Nimrud, and now in the British Museum, the other the stele of the same monarch in the British Museum which was found at Kurkh. These monuments give us an account of the king's victories in Syria, and notably of the battle of Karkar, where Achab, king of Israel, was defeated. This victory occurred in the sixth year<sup>19</sup> of his reign, after the 14th of the month Lyar, about April or May. Twelve years later, as we read on a pavement slab from Calah, in the eighteenth year of his reign, Shalmaneser received tribute from Jehu, king of Israel. It appears from data in the Books of Kings, that the destruction of the house of Achab by Jehu took place about twelve years and a half after Achab's death. Hence we infer that the death of Achab and his defeat by Shalmaneser must have nearly coincided in point of time, and we are, consequently, justified in placing Achab's death in the sixth year of Shalmaneser's reign. This year coincided, as we learn from the monuments, with the Eponym year of Daian-Asshur. It is thus important that this year be located. A solar eclipse is recorded as having taken place in the Eponym Pur-ilu-Sagal-e, in the month Sivan. Can this eclipse be determined? Astronomical calculations have shown that there occurred a total eclipse at Nineveh on June 15th, 763 B. C. On the other hand, according to Oppert, there was a similar eclipse in Assyria on June 13, 809 B. C., and this he identifies with that of the Eponym year in question. Want of time and of sufficient data have not permitted me to verify the statement of Dr. Oppert, though it is by no means likely, that a man of his learning and reputation would have made it without sufficient ground.

<sup>18</sup> For this canon, and for the Assyrian Expedition lists, see Rogers' *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, vol. I., p. 323, and Schrader's "*Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*," p. 299, 356.

<sup>19</sup> This account is supplementary to the history in Kings, and the battle of Karkar belongs before III Kings XXII.



The Eponym Pur-ilu-sa-gal-e is according to Oppert, in the series 91 years later than that of Daian-Asshur. To fix then the latter, we have to choose between the years 763, and 809 B. C. In the former hypothesis, we would have the year 854 B. C. for the battle of Karkar, and the death of Achab, and, according to the latter, the year 900 B. C. for the same event, giving us a difference of 46 years.

As some 80 years elapsed between the death of Achab and that of Solomon, the latter occurred either in 934, or 980 B. C. Solomon reigned 40 years, and the construction of the temple began in the fourth year of his reign, consequently in 971, or 1017 before Christ. Both dates differ but little from Challoner's computation, which places the finishing of the temple in A. M. 3000, B. C. 1000, and the death of Solomon in A. M. 3029, B. C. 971. We can then well afford to admit that the building of the temple took place approximately about 1000 B. C. An important question now is: how many years elapsed between the beginning of Solomon's temple and the Exodus? We have here four sources of information to guide us, first the statement of III Kings VI, 1., that the temple was begun in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel came out of Egypt, secondly the chronology of the Book of Judges, thirdly the generations of the sons of Levi, as we find them in I Paral. VI., and, finally, the genealogy of David in Ruth IV. 18. Can these be made to agree?

Taking first the generations of Paralipomenon, we find that beginning with Eleazar, the son of Aaron, and continuing to Azarias, the first highpriest in the temple, we have fourteen generations. Assuming the average of a generation to be thirty-five years, we reach the result of 490 years between the Exodus, and the building of the temple.

The genealogy in Ruth will cause greater difficulty. Counting from Nahasson who lived at the time of the Exodus to Jesse, the father of David, we have only five generations. The same average of a generation would give us only 175 years to the birth of David, plus 73 which elapsed from his birth to the building of the temple, and we would have only 248 years between the Exodus and that event. In order to reach the required figure, it becomes necessary to stretch the generations of the descendants of Juda to a period of eighty years. This would give us 473 between the Exodus and the temple. There are two things to be remarked here, first that the reckoning by generations is a most uncertain process, and, secondly, that it is by no means improbable that the ancestors of David were very old men, who added to the number of their family, even at an advanced period of life.

We now come to the chronology of the Book of Judges. Whatever opinions may exist concerning this very complicated period of Israel's history, it is certain that it is not in antagonism with the statement of the Book of Kings. One calculation gives us 543 years between the Exodus and the temple, an excess of some 63 years. We may admit with Father Cornely that some of the Judges were simultaneous, and that sixty years may possibly be eliminated. Hulskamp, cited by Rohrbacher,<sup>20</sup> makes an ingenious calculation which gives the exact number of years, 479.

Comparing these various data, we are led with Captain Haynes, to place explicit confidence in the statement of the Book of Kings, that 479 years elapsed between the Exodus, and the beginning of the temple. If we place the latter event approximately about 1000 B. C., we should look for the former about 1480 B. C.<sup>21</sup>

As it is impossible to put back so far the reign of Merneptah, we feel constrained to leave the XIX dynasty out of the question, and look else where for a solution of our difficulty. By assuming the year 971 to be the date of the beginning of the temple, taking 763, as the year of the Solar eclipse, we must place the Exodus in 1450 B. C. This would land us, according to the more recent authorities, in the last years of the reign of Thotmes III. His successor, Amenhotep II, began his reign in 1448 B. C. Allowing for errors of calculation which are quite in order for that remote period of time, it will be found that it is quite possible chronologically to make Thotmes III. Pharaoh of the oppression, and his son and successor, Amenhotep II, Pharaoh of the Exodus. The entrance into Canaan would then belong to the reign of Amenhotep III., and the period of confusion in Palestine, portrayed by the Amarna letters. This would agree well with tradition which places the Exodus in the eighteenth dynasty.

By letting the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt last 215 years, we should be carried back to the year 1665 B. C. Two hundred and ninety years back of that date, basing the figure on Biblical texts, would bring us to the birth of Abraham, which we would have to place in 1955 B. C., 37 years after the date accepted by Dr. Challoner, or 2008 A. M., 1992 B. C.

The question as to whether it is possible to bring the life of the Patriarch of the Hebrews into that of the Babylonian, Hammurabi cannot be treated here. Let it suffice to say, that the chronological figures of Genesis do not afford a basis for an accurate computation of time. Neither can we rely upon an uncertain Babylonian chron-

<sup>20</sup> *Histoire Ecclesiastique.*

<sup>21</sup> A Lapide places the Exodus in 1496 B. C., and, therefore, the Temple in 1016 or 17.

ology. For that remote period, much is necessarily left to vague conjecture.

But what of the cities of Pithom and Ramesses? The difficulty vanishes when we reflect that there are other instances in Scripture of passages which could only have been inserted at a date posterior to the events narrated. Thus in Gen. XXXVI 31 the words: "Before the children of Israel had a king," must belong to a later epoch, unless we accept the interpretation of those who by "King" understand chief. In Gen. XII. 6, the writer says: "Now the Chanaanite was at that time in the land," as though he had ceased to be there, when the words were written. The name Hebron used in Gen. XIII, 18, and elsewhere, is a post-Mosaic name for Kiriath Arbe (Josue XIV, 15, XV, 13). The name Dan for Lais is post-Mosaic (Josue XIX, 47).

There is no doubt that Pithom and Ramesses bore the impress of the great conqueror of that name, but Naville's excavations have proved that Tel-el-Maskhuta occupies the site of the ancient Ero or Heroopolis, where Josephus says that Joseph met his aged father, on the latter's entrance into Egypt.<sup>22</sup> The name may have been changed to Per Tum at a later period.

In Genesis XLVII, 11, we read that Joseph gave a possession to his father and his brethren in Egypt, in the best place of the land, in Ramesses, as Pharaoh had commanded." In the days of Joseph, there was no Ramesses, hence the name is retrospective, and attributed to a site known thus, when the text was written, but which, in Joseph's day, bore another name. In the 13th century B. C., the central portion of the Eastern Delta was known as the land of Ramesses, owing to the great enterprises there of the monarch of that name.

It is not at all unlikely that the city which, at a later period bore the name of Ramesses was the ancient Zoan or Tanis.<sup>23</sup> Thus we have an answer to this difficulty.

In what manner can the Israel stele of Merneptah be explained, on which it is stated that "Israel is destroyed; their crops are ruined?" Very easily. It is a matter of Egyptian history, that in 1222 B. C. or thereabouts, Merneptah undertook a campaign into Palestine to quell a revolt. His father, Ramesses, had fought in Syria before him, waging fierce wars in the Hittite country, where the famous battle of Kadish was fought. Egyptian suzerainty had evidently not completely died away in Palestine, where the Israelites had now been established more than two hundred years, waging wars

<sup>22</sup> Antiquitates I II., C. VII., 5.

<sup>23</sup> See Egypt under the Pharaohs, by Brugsch Bell.



against the Canaanites and the Philistines. There is a likelihood, that the Jews may have borne arms against Merneptah and that his victory over them may be the one recorded on his stele.

I may here add that the mummy of Thotmes III was found in 1881 in the same place as that of Ramesses II., and that of Amenhotep or Amenophis II. was discovered in 1898, together with Merneptah, son of Ramesses, so that whether we regard Ramesses or Thotmes as the Pharaoh of the oppression, and Amenhotep or Merneptah as of the Exodus, we may now, after the lapse of thousands of years, gaze upon their inanimate forms

As time goes on, and the land of Egypt reveals to us more and more of the past, the conclusions of to-day will, no doubt, be modified tomorrow but the world will, at least, have the satisfaction of drawing nearer to the truth.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

Baltimore, Md.

## PIUS VI. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

WHEN the troops of the French Republic invaded Savoy in September, 1792, and began the long series of campaigns which had such disastrous results for Italy, that country had enjoyed uninterrupted peace during forty-four years, since the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle which in 1748 had put an end to the contest caused by the disputed succession to the throne of Austria. Italy was, therefore, in a prosperous condition; the population of all the states had increased, and, together with that of the islands of Sicily and Sardinia amounted to about nineteen millions;<sup>1</sup> the taxes were generally light, especially in the States of the Church and in those of the Republic of Venice; in Lombardy, Tuscany and the Kingdom of Naples, the abuses to which the feudal power of the nobles had given rise, had been suppressed. Agriculture and commerce had been much developed, especially in Lombardy where the government of the Empress Maria Theresa had also introduced many financial reforms;<sup>2</sup> the hindrances to trade caused by the ancient system of levying tolls in the interior of the various states had been almost universally abolished, and both Pius VI and Leopold of Tuscany had brought large tracts of land under cultivation by the drainage works which they had carried on. Unfortunately, as a

<sup>1</sup> Carlo Denina—*Delle Rivoluzioni d'Italia*, Milano. 1820. III., p. 632.

<sup>2</sup> Cesare Cantù—*Storia degli Italiani*, Torino. 1877. XII., p. 295.

result of the long peace and of the love of pleasure which prevailed among all classes, most of all among those who should have been the leaders of the people, the warlike spirit which had of old distinguished the Italians, had become much enfeebled, and instead of the 600,000 soldiers which Italy could easily have maintained, there were not towards the end of the 18th century, more than 80,000 men under arms; half of whom formed the army of Piedmont, the only Italian State where the taste for a military career still existed among the aristocracy.<sup>3</sup>

Judging by the description of the country given by travellers in Italy in the 18th century the peasantry seem to have been on the whole contented with the governments and this was still more the case under the rule of the Pope and of the Republic of Venice, than under that of the reforming princes and ministers who were guided by the doctrines of "*les Philosophers*," such as Leopold I in Tuscany and du Tillot in the Duchy of Parma.<sup>4</sup>

The writings of Voltaire and Jean Jacques Rousseau had long been circulated in Italy, mostly among the middle classes, and had produced, though in a much less degree, the same feeling of discontent, the same desire of overthrowing all existing institutions, and the same hostility to religion which had prepared the way for the French Revolution.<sup>5</sup> The spectacle indeed of the outrages which followed the taking of the Bastille, and still more the massacres in Paris and other cities soon opened the eyes of many of those who were looking forward to the advent of an era of universal

<sup>3</sup> Denina—p. 630.

<sup>4</sup> Roland de la Platriere—Lettres ecrites de Suisse, d'Italie, de Sicile, et de Malte par M. . . . Avocat au Parlement, a Mme. . . . a Paris en 1776-1778, Amsterdam 1780. II., p. 211. "Il faut rendre cette justice aux employes des Etats du Pape, qu'ils sont moins interessees, qu'ils tracassent et vexent moins les voyageurs, que ceux d'aucun lieu de l'Italie et de la France." Idem IV., p. 412. (On arriving in the Papal States from Naples, 6th February, 1777.) "A resumer mes idees, d'apres les examens que j'ai ete a portee de faire et toutes les informations que j'ai pu prendre jusqu'ici, je trouve que le Gouvernement de l'Eglise, est un des plus doux, et que partout on l'influence de l'air n'est pas contraire aux hommes, ils sont en aussi grand nombre, aussi vigoureux, aussi actifs qu'aucuns Transapennins, et beaucoup plus que dans plusieurs parties du Royaume de Naples."

Idem II., p. 18, (At Parma.) "Les impots sont excessifs, le depense excede le revenu; la perception se fait avec rigueur, avec avidite, tout le monde y parait apre et necessiteux."

Idem p. 116. (At Florence.) "On y voit, dit-on, un despotisme reel, bien etabli, et le but unique est de tirer beaucoup d'argent."

<sup>5</sup> Roland de la Platriere—II., p. 116. (At Florence.) "On y est fou de Voltaire on devore Jean Jacques Rousseau. . . . on fait de sciences et d'arts, on s'accorde a mettre la France au dessus de tout."

Idem II., p. 355. (At Palermo.) "Cependant le litterature Francaise perce ici . . . nos livres de philosophie surtout s'y repandent bien plus qu'un ne l' imagine. Les editions qu'on a faites de l'Encyclopedie a Lucques et a Livourne, ont fourni a toute l'Italie, et en la Palerme."

Idem II., p. 408. (At Girgenti.) "On trouve chez eux (les habitants de Girgenti) l'Encyclopedie, edition de Lucques avec son plat commentaire."

liberty and equality, and their belief in the Utopias they had constructed was rudely shaken, but it was then too late to prepare to offer any resistance to a hostile invasion. The sovereigns of Europe had, however, begun to be alarmed by the anarchy which prevailed in France and by the diffusion of revolutionary ideas among their subjects; but, though they willingly gave an asylum in their states to the royalists who fled from France, they were restrained by their mutual jealousies from undertaking an armed intervention for the rescue of Louis XVI and the restoration of order, and they sought to obtain their objects merely by diplomatic methods.<sup>6</sup> The National Assembly soon obliged them to interfere more actively in the affairs of France, for along with the property of the French Church it confiscated the lands belonging to the Order of Malta, and to some of the Ecclesiastical Electors of Germany, and it annexed Avignon and the Comtor Venaissin which had been held by the Holy See since four centuries. This was not the only outrage offered to the Sovereign Pontiff; for, when the Brief of April 13th, 1791, by which Pius VI. formally condemned the *Constitution Civile*, and the members of the clergy who had taken the oath which it exacted, had become known, an effigy of the Holy Father clothed in Pontifical robes and wearing the tiara, was carried through the streets of Paris and burned in the garden of the Palais Royal; (May 4th, 1791), and as Mgr. Dugnani, the Papal Nuncio was unable to obtain any satisfaction or apology for this insult, he retired from his post, and the Holy See remained without a representative in France.

The flight of Louis XVI from Paris, his arrest at Varennes and the decree of the National Assembly surrendering him from the exercise of his regal functions, at last impelled the Emperor Leopold to seek to bring about some decided action on the part of Europe in defence of the unfortunate monarch. He therefore addressed a circular from Padua to the other sovereigns, inviting their co-operation in checking the excesses of the Revolution, and on August 27th, 1791, a conference took place at Pillnitz in Saxony between him and Frederic William II, the King of Prussia, but which had no other result than the expression of a hope that all the Powers would combine to take the most efficacious steps in proportion to their strength to enable the King of France to establish a monarchical government which should both acknowledge his rights, and be advantageous to his subjects; but no formal coalition was entered into.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Amedee Gabourd—Histoire de la Revolution et de l'Empire, Paris. 1848-51, I., p. 418.

<sup>7</sup> Comte d' Allonville—Memoires tires des Papiers d'un Homme d'Etat, Paris. 1821, I., p. 144.



On the acceptance by Louis XVI on September 13th of the Constitution drawn up by the Assembly the European powers suspended their preparations for war as they hoped that, at last, order was about to be restored in France. A further delay was caused by the sudden death (which has been ascribed to poison)<sup>8</sup> of the Emperor Leopold on March 1st, 1792, and the assassination on the 16th of the same month of Gustavus III, King of Sweden, who had long been anxious to take up arms against the rebellious French, and who had declared himself ready to land his troops at Ostend, if England would but support him with 12,000 Hanoverians.<sup>9</sup> But if the Powers in their negotiations, offered to desist from their warlike projects on condition that the monarchy should be re-established as it was in 1789; that Avignon should be restored to the Pope and the property of the French Church and of the German Electors given back; a part, at least, of the Assembly was anxious for a war, as it seemed the most efficacious means of imposing their ideas on the other nations. The strongest advocates of this method of spreading principles of the Revolution and therefore those who were really responsible for the war were the Girondins or Moderates,<sup>10</sup> who still consented to acknowledge a monarchical form of government, while the Jacobins, who were already ardent republicans, dreaded the popularity which a successful war might confer on the King and his Constitutional Ministry, and would have preferred to wait until their own party had obtained the supremacy.<sup>11</sup> As the Girondins then formed the majority in the Assembly, Louis XVI had been obliged to select his Ministers from among them and on April 20th, 1792, acting on the advice of General Dumouriez the Minister for foreign affairs he declared war against Austria.

With regard to the campaign which ensued on the northern and eastern frontiers of France against the armies of the Emperor of Austria and of the King of Prussia, it will be enough to remark that much of the ill-success of the Allies has been ascribed to the intrigues of the *Illuminati*, the members of the secret society founded by Weishaupt and affiliated to the Freemasons and Jacobins, who on many occasions rendered important services to the Revolutionary generals by causing the speedy surrender of fortresses which could otherwise have offered a prolonged resistance. The same secret

<sup>8</sup> Idem I., 157.

<sup>9</sup> Nicomede Bianchi. *Storia della Monarchia Piemontese dal 1773 sino al 1861*, Torino. 1877, I., p. 651.

<sup>10</sup> Gabourd—II., p. 133.

<sup>11</sup> d'Allonville—op. cit. I., p. 276. "Les emigres surtout deplorent la mort du roi de Suede. . . . La plupart attribuaient a la *propagande* la premiere idee du complot sous lequel venait de succomber ce prince. 'Le coup est parti de France, s'ecriaient ils, et les regicides preparent bien d'autres forfaits.'"

organizations had also been at work in Italy, and Victor Amedeus III (1726-1796), king of Piedmont was well aware of the agitation which was being excited in his states, especially in Savoy by the emissaries of the association known as the *Club de la Propagande*.<sup>12</sup> In October, 1791 he tried to induce the other Italian States to form a league for the purpose of hindering the diffusion of revolutionary principles and of rendering each other mutual assistance in the case of disturbances among their subjects, pointing out to them at the same time that Piedmont was their only protection against an inundation which threatened to devastate every part of the Peninsula.<sup>13</sup> The King's proposal met with no success, for the Italian princes dreaded the projects of aggrandisement which the House of Savoy was known to entertain, and the Republic of Venice declared that it would observe an absolute neutrality.

As the Girondins had no desire to plunge France into a war with all Europe, they sought to detach Victor Amedeus from the coalition and be at least assured that he would remain neutral; the French resident at Genoa, M. de Semonville was therefore instructed to proceed to Turin and to offer the King the Austrian possessions in Lombardy, which the rulers of Piedmont had long coveted, in exchange for Nice and Savoy, which would give France the Alps for a frontier. But as de Semonville was known to have Jacobin principles, and was accused of circulating seditious pamphlets throughout Italy to excite the people to rise against their sovereigns, Victor Amedeus ordered him to be arrested and expelled from Piedmont; (April, 1792) and when Dumouriez offered to send him a more acceptable envoy, he refused to negotiate "with a Government founded on the sands and while France was on the brink of a precipice."<sup>14</sup> And yet the King could not find out what were the exact terms of the agreement between Austria and Prussia; he did not know what conditions might be demanded from him in return for the assistance which might be given him or even if he could reckon on any. He was so sure however of his army that he declared himself to be ready to invade France and conquer Dauphine, if the Emperor would give him 15,000 men; but Prince von Kaunitz told

<sup>12</sup> *Le Club de la Propagande* was a club founded about 1786 by Condorcet and Sieyes with freemasons of the highest order. By the subscriptions of its members it owned before the end of 1791 30,000,000 of livres (£1,200,000), Its object was to spread atheism throughout the world, and to excite the people everywhere against their governments.

L'Abbe Barruel. *Memoires pour servir a l'histoire du Jacobinisme*. London, 1797-98. Vol. II., p. 434.

<sup>13</sup> Abate Cristophoro Tentori—Raccolta cronologica—ragionata di documenti inediti che formano la storia diplomatica della rivoluzione e caduta della repubblica di Venezia. August, 1799. P. 33.

<sup>14</sup> Bianchi—I. 662.

his ambassador at Vienna, that an alliance with Piedmont was not of much importance to Austria, as it was known that the King would make no alliance with France, and the Austrian troops sufficed to defend Lombardy. After repeated requests Victor Amedeus was at last promised the aid of 10,000 men, on condition that he should undertake to feed them; but, as he still refused to negotiate with France and to offer any reparation for the expulsion of de Semonville, Savoy was suddenly invaded by General de Montesquiors who crossed the frontier on the night of September 21st and occupied Chambéry without resistance on the part of the Piedmontese troops, (for, though the men were brave, they were commanded by aged and incapable officers,) while Nice was seized by General Anslin. The Jacobins of Savoy were soon organized by emissaries from the Paris Commune, and a National Assembly of deputies from its 658 municipalities was convoked at Chambéry, which confiscated the property of the Church, swept away all the ancient institutions of the country and declared for annexation to France. A decree of the Convention ratified this proposal on November 27th, 1792 giving to Savoy the name of *Department du Mont Blanc*; and on January 31st, 1793, the territory of Nice was also united as the *Departement des Alpes Maritimes*.<sup>15</sup>

Four commissioners among whom was the victorious Gregoire, the constitutional bishop of Eure-et-Loir, were sent to introduce the institutions of the French Republic into Savoy. They immediately expelled the bishops; suppressed the religious communities, and proclaimed *la Constitution Civile du Clerge*, substituting, however, for its original oath, that more recently adopted, "to maintain liberty and equality," but which had also been condemned by the Sovereign Pontiff, for it implied the acceptance of the preceeding decrees which had been rejected by the Holy See. As had been the case in France, the great majority of the clergy refused to take the oath, and were either imprisoned or had to seek safety in flight; while the people remained firmly attached to their faith, though the churches and all they contained were seized, the bells carried off and melted down, and the steeples demolished under the government of Albitte who succeeded Gregoire in the administration of the department. This representative of the Convention persecuted not only the Catholic Clergy, but even those priests who had accepted the *Constitution Civile* and taken the oath, and many of them were driven by the terror which he inspired, to sign a declaration by which they openly apostatised and renounced their sacerdotal character.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Gabourd—III., p. 160.

<sup>16</sup> Ludovic Sciout—*Histoire de la Constitution du Clerge*, Paris 1872-1881. IV., p. 63.



As soon as Freemasonry had been introduced into Italy, the vigilance of the Sovereign Pontiffs had detected the power for evil which it derived from the secrecy in which it enveloped its proceedings, and the dangers with which it menaced both the church and the state in spite of its protestations of philanthropy and benevolence. It was therefore condemned in 1738 by Clement XII and forbidden under pain of excommunication, a sentence which was renewed in 1751 by Benedict XIV. Notwithstanding these prohibitions, a lodge bearing the name of "*Gli Amici Sinceri*" was opened in Rome in 1787 by an American, a Pole, and five Frenchmen, which received its instructions and watchwords from the *Grand Orient* of Paris, and was in correspondence with lodges in Milan, Naples, Lyons, Malta and other towns.

The celebrated Sicilian swindler and imposter Giuseppe Balsamo who, under the name of Count Cagliostro, had for many years, successfully traded on the credulity of all classes in various countries and who had been admitted into the society in London in 1777, joined this lodge on his arrival in Rome; and founded another in the Villa Malta on the Pincian Hill, according to the Egyptian rite of which he was the originator. He seems to have acquired some adherents among the higher classes, but at the end of December, 1789 he was arrested and condemned to be imprisoned for life in the fortress of San Leo where he died in 1795. But though the lodge was suppressed, and some of its members driven from Rome, it had left traces of its influence like those which had been established in other Italian cities, where they had served to organise the disaffected and prepare them to be ready to take the lead if they found a favourable opportunity.

Since the year 1769, France had been represented in Rome by Cardinal Francois Joachim de Pierre de Bernis, but when the *Assemblée Nationale* enacted from all functionaries the *serment civique*<sup>17</sup> by which they swore fidelity to the new Constitution and thereby accepted all the measures about to be decreed against the Church, he refused to take the oath, and resigned his post as French Ambassador on March 16, 1791. As the Comte Louis Phillipe de Segur who was named as his successor, had taken his oath,<sup>18</sup> the Holy Father refused to receive him, and France was thenceforth un-

<sup>17</sup> The *serment civique* was decreed by the *Assemblée Nationale* on February 4th, 1790. It was: "Je jure d'être fidele a la nation, a la loi et au roi, et de maintenir de tout mon pouvoir la Constitution decretee par l'Assemblée Nationale et acceptee par le Roi." Every public functionary was obliged to take it.

<sup>18</sup> Joseph du Tiel—Rome, Naples et le Directoire. *Armistices et Traites*, Paris, 1902, p. 4.

represented in Rome, save by the Cardinal's secretary, Alphonse Timothee Bernard.<sup>19</sup>

The French plenipotentiary at Naples was Armand Louis, Baron de Mackau,<sup>20</sup> who had been appointed by Dumouriez in April, 1792; when the Republic was proclaimed on September 22, King Ferdinand resolved to break off all diplomatic relations with France and requested him to leave, but before he took his departure, the arrival in the Bay of Naples of a French squadron commanded by Rear-Admiral Latouche-Treville and the threat of a bombardment obliged the King to acknowledge the Republic and accept the Baron as its envoy. By the order of Lebrun, the minister of Foreign Affairs, de Mackau had sent to Rome in November his secretary Hugon de Bassville, not in any official capacity, but rather as a spy, to obtain information with regard to the plans of the Papal Government, and the state of its fortresses, especially Civita Vecchia. On his arrival in Rome, Bassville took up the position of protector of the turbulent French residents in Rome, mostly artists or tradesmen, who were well known to be ardent partisans of the Revolution and engaged in spreading its principles, and were therefore suspected by the Papal Government and held in detestation by the people. Though without other credentials than a letter of introduction from M. de Machan to Cardinal Zelada, the Secretary of State, and without intellectual gifts or diplomatic experience, he terrorised by his overbearing insolence the Papal Court, which was aware of its weakness, and knew that Admiral Truguet's fleet was coming off the coast of Italy; though it could not have learned as yet that its commander had been instructed by the Convention "to chastise the Pope and the Sacred College, and teach them the respect due to the French Republic." This dictatorial conduct on the part of Bassville produced intense irritation among all classes in Rome, and the bitter satires circulated against the French contributed to influence still more the anger of the people; but the disaster which overtook Admiral Latouche's fleet which, shortly after leaving Naples, was scattered by a violent storm and lost many vessels, relieved the anxiety experienced by the Papal Government and Bassville's influence declined. De Mackau still hoped to bring about some revolutionary manifestation in Rome against the Sovereign Pontiff, though nothing in the relations of the Roman people with its rulers denoted any seditious tendencies

<sup>19</sup> L. Vicchi. *Les Français à Rome pendant la Convention (1792-1795)*. Roma, 1892.

<sup>20</sup> His family, originally Mac Hau, emigrated from Galway in the time of Queen Elizabeth, to Warem in the Diocese of Liege (Belgium) and thence to Strasburg in 1675, and got the title of Barons of the Holy Roman Empire in 1698. Armand Louis Mackau served in the French army, then entered the diplomatic service, and was named by Dumouriez plenipotentiary at Naples, in 1792. (Masson p. 26.)

on their part, and to carry out his plans sent to Rome on December 20, one of Latouche's officers, Jean Charles de Flotte, a man of noble family, but an enthusiastic republican, with a circular which Mougé the minister of Marine had sent to all the French Consuls, ordering them to remove the scutcheons bearing the *fleurs-de-lis* of the Bourbons from all buildings belonging to France, and to replace them by the emblem of the Republic; the figure of Liberty wearing the Phrygian cap; provided that in so doing they met with no opposition.

Cardinal Zelada offered no objection to this order and the large stone scutcheon with the fleurs-de-lis over the door of the French Academy,<sup>21</sup> as well as that over the French Consulate were removed during the night of January 1st, 1793; but the Bourbon arms were still allowed to remain over the Churches belonging to France and over the French Embassy, where the Cardinal de Bernis still continued to reside though he was no longer ambassador. They were not, however, replaced by the image of the goddess of Liberty for M. Digne, the French Consul, would not allow it without the permission of the Pope, which the Holy Father refused to give, as his own arms had been torn down from the Papal Consulate at Marseilles in the month of August, dragged through the streets and burned. Bassville and de Flotte still continued their seditious manifestations; they appeared everywhere, even at the Vatican, wearing the tricolour cockade, and, together with the French students, they pulled down the statue of Louis XIV from its pedestal in the Courtyard of the Academy, and crowned with laurels a bust of Brutus which stood in their dining room. The Roman people deeply resented this conduct; there was a general feeling that a sudden outbreak of popular indignation might take place at any moment, and by Bassville's advice, most of the students left for Naples, where de Flotte had gone to bring to de Mackau a memorandum from Cardinal Zelada recapitulating the many insults which had been offered to the Holy See by France, and finally refusing permission to raise the emblem of the Republic.

De Flotte returned to Rome on January 12th, with de Mackau's orders to place the arms of the Republic over the doors of the Academy and of the Consulate within twenty-four hours; but M. Digne declined to obey him unless he were authorized to do so by

---

<sup>21</sup> The French Academy in Rome was founded by Colbert under Louis XIV., in 1666, and occupied the Palazzo Mancini (now Salviati) on the Corso from 1725 until 1803, when it was removed to the Villa Medici on the Pincian Hill.

In 1792 there were in Rome about 100 French artists and men of letters, besides workmen and shopkeepers. (Masson, p. 20.)

The French Embassy was then in the Palazzo do Carolis, opposite the Church of San Marcello in the Corso (Vicchi, p. 22.)



the Papal Government. On the same day Cardinal Zelada gave an audience to Bassville and de Flotte, and though the latter threatened him in the most violent language that, if he hindered the raising of the new scutcheon, a war might ensue which would result in the humiliation of Rome, he still refused to yield, and warned de Flotte to beware of taking any steps which might increase the irritation of the people. But this warning produced no effect on the two enthusiasts for they left the Vatican fully resolved to raise the arms at least over the French Consulate.

The following day, January 13th, was a Sunday; about three o'clock in the afternoon, at a time when the Corso is usually thronged Bassville and de Flotte together with Bassville's wife and child, and his secretary, drove along it in an open carriage wearing tricolour cockades in their hats as had the coachman and the two footmen. As they approached the Piazza Colonna the people closed round them, hooting and insulting them and became at last so menacing that the coachman turning his horses drove rapidly down a side street to the Palazzo Palombard in the Via dell' Impresa, the residence of the French Consul Etienne Moutte with whom Bassville was lodging. The crowd pursued him thither, smashed the windows of the palace with showers of stones, broke open the doors and rushed through the apartments seeking him; and before a patrol of soldiers which was in the neighborhood could come to his assistance, Bassville was mortally wounded, while de Flotte escaped through a window. Bassville was then carried by the soldiers to a guard-room in the Via Frattina where he died on the following day and the Papal Government assisted his family and de Flotte to leave Rome where their lives were not in safety, and return to Naples. The populace then sacked the French Academy and many French shops; it was restrained with difficulty from burning down the Ghetto, as the Jews were believed to be partisans of the Revolution and it was only by employing strong patrols and by sending missionaries to preach in the more disturbed quarters that order was again restored in Rome.

The minister of Foreign Affairs, Labrun, while still unaware of Bassville's death, had written to him to order him to return to his post at Naples, and to inform him that the Executive Council was about to send a representative who would treat with the Court of Rome; observing at the same time, that as the Pope had not recognised the Republic, the attempt to substitute so hastily its emblem for the ancient arms of France must have seemed strange to him. It was, in fact, a reprimand to Bassville and an intimation that his post was not at Rome but at Naples. When, however, the fatal

news was received in Paris on February 1st, the Executive Council in its report to the Convention declared that Bassville was invested with an official character and was the victim of a people led astray by the fanatical suggestions of its Government, and the Convention, without making any inquiry into the matter, decreed that the murder of Bassville, who was described as the *charge d'affaires* of the French Republic in Rome, should be promptly and terribly avenged.

In consequence of this decree M. Francois Cacault, the new envoy to the Sovereign Pontiff, was directed to request General Biron who commanded the troop at Nice to prepare an expedition against Rome; but the project could not be carried out, for Biron's army could hardly maintain its positions in front of the Piedmontese, and the finances of the Republic were not in a sufficiently flourishing condition to allow it to engage in a distant campaign. Cacault therefore, came on to Florence, and finding that the Papal Court still declined to receive a representative of the Republic, he remained there to watch the course of events; which Mackau, acting on his own responsibility, tried to induce the Neapolitan Government by the offer of a portion of the Papal States, to take up the cause of the Republic. This proposal was rejected; for the Court replied that public opinion would not allow any hostile measures to be adopted against the Holy Father; it broke off all relations with the envoy after the execution of Louis XVI, and on September 1st ordered him to leave Naples within eight days.

The wars in which the French Republic was engaged during the three following years on all its frontiers against the armies of Prussia, Austria and Piedmont, and in the interior against the royalists in la Vendee, hindered the Convention from carrying out the projects of vengeance it had formed against Rome; its armies, indeed, made but slow progress in Piedmont, where no decisive results were achieved on either side; but the influence of the Revolution gradually penetrated into the Kingdom and gave rise to conspiracies which gradually prepared the way for the eventual downfall of the monarchy. The arrival of General Bonaparte on March 26th, 1795, to take the command of the army of Italy, was followed by a rapid succession of brilliant victories over the Piedmontese and Austrians; until Piedmont was obliged to demand an armistice at Cherasco on April 26th, and by the treaty of peace signed on May 15th to place all its fortresses in the hands of the French. It must however be observed that this success was tarnished by the merciless plundering of the villages and the ill-treatment of the peasantry along the line of march of the Republican army and that in many

cases its operations were much facilitated by Piedmontese traitors in the pay of the Directory.<sup>22</sup>

After the occupation of Milan, the Directory wishing to execute the plans of the Convention against Rome and always seeking an opportunity of inflicting some injury on the Church, ordered Bonaparte to march with half his troops against Rome and Naples, leaving the other half under the command of General Kellermann to follow the Austrian army; but Bonaparte refused to undertake a distant expedition before the Austrians were completely driven from Italy and he even offered to send in his resignation, which the Directory, though they feared and mistrusted him, did not dare to accept as they dreaded the outcry which the disgrace of so successful a leader would have excited throughout France. Although therefore not in any immediate danger, Pius VI thought it prudent to come to terms with the conqueror, for the Dukes of Parma and Modena who had not taken any part in the war, had just been obliged to purchase an armistice by the sacrifice of several millions, and the King of Naples, who had indeed sent troops and vessels to help the English at the siege of Toulon, and who had still 2000 cavalry serving with the Austrian army, was preparing to withdraw from the alliance. So by a secret article in the treaty concluded between France and Spain<sup>23</sup> in the preceding year (23d July, 1795) it had been stipulated that in case any negotiation took place between the Pope and the French Republic, Spain would be allowed to mediate; the Holy Father requested Don Jose Nicolas d'Azara, the Spanish Ambassador in Rome, to accompany his envoy the Marchese Gnudi for that purpose to Milan, where they arrived on May 28th.

The surrounding country was already in a state of revolt; there

<sup>22</sup> Memoires de l'Adjudant-General Jean Andrieux, chef d'Etat-major de la Cavalerie de l'Armee d'Italie, charge du bureau secret (1795-1797) Paris, 1893, I., p. 8. "Lorsque l'invasion de Ventose et Germinal de l'an IV. (March and April, 1796) commença, les esprits se trouverent disposes de telle sorte qu'il fut tres facile d'y trouver des traitres, au point que tout autre general, meme tres mediocre, y fut entre (en Italie) presque sans resistance."

P. 21. " . . . . Quantite d'individus parmi lesquels on comptait meme de tres honnetes gens . . . . favorisaient en secret les nouvelles doctrines. . . . On dut meme a quelques uns de ces innocents de bons details sur quantite de sentiers inconnus ou il semblait que la chose seule fut passer. Ils en donnerent sur les positions diverses de l'ennemi, sur ses forces, sur ses desseins et sur ce que valaient les generaux qui nous etaient opposes. Ils ne furent pas meme etrangers aux marches faits avec quelques traitres qui liverent les principaux defiles."

<sup>23</sup> The recent discovery among the archives of the Vatican by the Vicomte de Richemont of Mgr. Caleppi's minutes and notes which had been considered as lost, has enabled him to publish in "*Le Correspondant*," of September 10, 1897, an interesting account of the negotiations in Milan, Bologna, Paris, Florence and Tolentino, by means of which the Papal government, though weak and friendless, was able to ward off for nine months the attacks of the Directory and its victorious general.



had been riots against the French at Milan, and the people of Pavia, irritated by the exactions of the invaders, who had been enthusiastically greeted on their arrival by the local Jacobins, who had at once planted a tree of liberty and formed a club, had risen on the morning of the 23d to the cry of "*Viva l'Imperatore*"<sup>24</sup> and forced the small French garrison which held the Castle to surrender. The peasantry of the environs had also taken arms, but the rising was speedily suppressed by Bonaparte who ordered the town to be plundered for several hours as well as the neighboring village of Bignasco, half of which was reduced to ashes. At Milan, in consequence of the disturbances eighty of the principal citizens had been arrested and carried away as hostages and the representatives of Pius VI saw the sacred vessels which had been taken from the churches of Pavia and Bignasco being sold in the streets.<sup>25</sup>

The Directory expected to find immense treasures in Rome, and when d'Azara began to negotiate with Soliceti and Garran, the commissioners of the Republic, they demanded the payment of a war tax of 50,000,000 of francs which the Envoy rejected as absurd, and offered ten millions; a proposal which required to be referred to the Directory. The answer did not arrive till a fortnight later, when Bonaparte invited the envoys to meet him at Bologna, which General Augereau had seized on June 19th without declaration of war. The Papal soldiers had offered no resistance, for Pius VI, who knew that the small detachments of troops stationed in the Legations could not stop the march of the Republicans, had given orders that the French should be received peaceably, but that the authorities should make a protest against the occupation.<sup>26</sup> Ferrara, Faenza, Imola and Ravenna were also taken by the French and the Papal Legates expelled; but though the middle classes in the large cities who were already gained over to the cause of the Revolution, hastened to manifest their hostility to the Papal Government, and the Senate of Bologna swore fidelity to the French Republic, the peasantry and the inhabitants of the small towns remained faithful to the Holy See. This was shown at Lugo not far from Ravenna;<sup>27</sup> where the people, irritated at seeing the reliquary of S. Ilara, the patron of the town, and the jewels which ornamented an image of the Blessed Virgin, carried away by the Commissioners charged with the collection of the war tax imposed by the French, rose in arms and called the peasantry from the surrounding villages to

<sup>24</sup> Silo Manfredi—*L'Insurrezione e il sacco di Pavia nel Maggio, 1796*. Pavia, 1900.

<sup>25</sup> De Richmont in *le Correspondant*, September 10, 1897, p. 804.

<sup>26</sup> Giov. Batt. Tavanti—*Fasti del S. P. Pio VI.*, 1804, III., p. 279.

<sup>27</sup> Giov. Fr. Rambelli—*Cenno storico del moto e saccheggioamento chi Lugo nel, 1796*, Bologna, 1834.

their help. They expelled two attacks of the French, but a third commanded by Augereau and supported by artillery overcame their resistance and after long and desperate fighting, the town was taken and plundered and the leaders of the insurrection shot.

When the negotiations began at Bologna, Bonaparte sought to intimidate the Papal envoys by the insolence of his demeanor, though he knew that while the Austrians were still in Italy, he could not venture to advance upon Rome, especially at that season of the year, when, as he wrote to the Directory, each day's march would have put 200 men on the sick list. Azara, indeed, soon contrived to elicit this fact from Saliceti and Garran, to Bonaparte's indignation, and he has been accused of not having made sufficient use of it to obtain less onerous conditions for the Holy See.<sup>28</sup> The armistice was signed on June 23rd, 1796 and by it the Sovereign Pontiff was obliged to pay to the French Republic 21,000,000 of livres tournois;<sup>29</sup> 15,500,000 in gold and silver, and 5,500,000 in provisions, merchandise, etc., and to give up 500 manuscripts from the Vatican library, as well as 100 works of art, among which should be the busts of Junius Brutus, and Marcus Brutus. A plenipotentiary was to be sent to Paris for the conclusion of a definite peace, and in the meanwhile the French troops were to occupy the Legations of Bologna and Ferrara, as well as the citadel of Ancona, but the town might still remain under the Papal authorities. All persons imprisoned for political offences were to be released; the ports of the Papal States were to be closed to the ships of the powers at war with France; and three hundred thousand francs were to be paid to the family of Bassville and to the persons who had suffered any loss by the riot in which he had lost his life.

Independently of the millions by which the Sovereign Pontiff was forced to purchase peace, enormous sums were raised in the Legation, where the cash in the public treasuries and the pledges in the *Monts-de-Piete* were seized and heavy contributions of corn and cattle imposed for the support of the army. The generals too, the army contractors, and the agents charged with the collection of the war taxes, plundered on their own account both the conquered people and their own government; amassing thereby colossal fortunes while the troops were starving and in rags, and though Bonaparte's efforts to put a stop to this disgraceful speculation were sincere, for he saw the odium and the contempt it was bringing on the French nation, and the dangerous animosity it was exciting among the Italian people, his protests and his chastisements were of no avail.

<sup>28</sup> Sciout—Le Directoire, Paris, 1897, I., p. 668.

<sup>29</sup> The value of the *livre tournois* in modern French Currency is 0.987 fcs.

The envoy sent to Paris to conclude a treaty of peace was the Abate Pieracchi, who, to satisfy the prejudices of the Directory, was obliged to lay aside the title and the dress of an ecclesiastic and travel as a layman. He was instructed to call attention to the fact that no satisfaction had as yet been made for the insults offered to the Sovereign Pontiff, for the invasion of his States and the annexation of Avignon and the Comtas Venaissin, but not to touch upon religious questions, with regard to which there could be no discussion. The Abate also brought with him the draft of a brief which was to be addressed to the Catholics of France, exhorting them to submit to their Government and expressing the hope that their submission might induce their rulers to protect religion and to tolerate the observance of the precepts of the Gospel and of the rules of Ecclesiastical discipline. But the Directory at their first interview with Pieracchi on August 12th, insisted, as a primary condition of the treaty, that the Holy Father should disavow, revoke and annul all the briefs, bulls, rescripts, and decrees which had been published relatively to the affairs of France since 1789; that is to say, all the acts by which he had condemned the *Constitution Civile du Clerge* and the schismatical church established by it, which the Directors, who were bitterly hostile to all religion, were, at that moment, engaged in persecuting quite as actively as they had persecuted the Catholic Church. They also demanded that Pius VI should pay 300,000 francs a month until the peace was signed; that he should give up Benevento and Pontecorvo as well as the Duchies of Castro and Ronaglione; close his ports to the enemies of France, and admit French garrisons into Civita Vecchia and Ancona.

As Pieracchi refused to discuss the question of the withdrawal of the briefs, he was ordered to leave Paris at once and he withdrew, without having alluded to the brief of which he was the bearer, but after his departure, the Directors received from Cacault, who was then in Rome, a copy of this document which had been communicated to him by Azara; they published it in the Press, but it excited only mistrust among the Catholics who refused to accept it, and it is not comprised in the official collection of the Acts of the Holy See.<sup>30</sup>

The decree by which the Directory put an end to the negotiation with the Abate Pieracchi, under the pretext that his powers were insufficient, was followed by another which authorized Garran and Saliceti, the commissioners of the Republic in Florence to treat with the plenipotentiaries who should be named by the Sovereign Pontiff. Mgr. Lorenzo Caleppi, who had already acquired the reputation of a talented diplomatist in his missions to Vienna and Naples,

---

<sup>30</sup> De Richmond, p. 812.



was the Envoy selected for the purpose, and the Cavaliere d'Azara again consented to act as mediator. Mgr. Caleppi was instructed to demand some mitigation of the harsh conditions imposed at Bologna, and with regard to the revocation of the acts relating to the French Church, to which Pius VI could not consent, he was authorised to state, that the Sovereign Pontiff had often declared in his briefs that his sole object was to guard the rights of the Church and of the Holy See; that he had never sought to interfere with the administration of temporal affairs, and that therefore, in order that there might be no doubt on the subject, he was ready to advise the Catholics to render obedience to their rulers, as long as religion was not in danger.

When Mgr. Caleppi met the French Commissioners in Florence on September 9th, he found them inflexible with regard to the question of the briefs, and not only resolved to make no concessions, but with orders to exact even more than had been demanded at Bologna. Still more of the Papal territory was to be ceded to France; heavier contributions were to be levied; the Holy Father was to treat as his enemies those of the Republic, to suppress the Inquisition and to proclaim religious liberty in his States, and that at a time when in France the Catholic clergy were under sentence of deportation or death.

On learning these conditions, Mgr. Caleppi immediately left for Rome to seek further instructions, without having been able to present to the French representatives the conciliatory proposals of which he was the bearer; and on his arrival a Consistory was summoned to deliberate on the question. Mgr. Caleppi's notes have preserved for us the opinions of the members of the Sacred College. They unanimously rejected the ultimatum of the Directory, and the reply to it, which Mgr. Caleppi was instructed to draw up, stated in frank and dignified language that it was absolutely impossible for the Holy See to withdraw its censures, or to submit to conditions which should be prejudicial to the Catholic religion or to the rights of the Church, and that the Sovereign Pontiff would persist in his refusal even at the risk of his life.

This resolute answer instead of provoking the indignation of the Commissioners, on the contrary surprised them and embarrassed them, and at Azara's suggestion they willingly agreed to accept the mediation of the King of Spain, to which the Holy Father consented; but only with regard to the temporal questions; as he could not recall the measures he had taken concerning the Church; and the responsibility for the interruption of the negotiations thus remained with the French Government. At the same time Pius VI

appealed to all the Catholic powers for assistance and suspended the execution of the conditions imposed by the armistice of Bologna. The herds of cattle, the sums of money and the works of art which were on their way to the French, were therefore brought back to Rome, for the Holy Father saw that the Republicans were bent on war and were only waiting for the payment of his contributions to continue it.

A civic guard of 6000 men was at once formed for the defence of Rome and the nobles showed their loyalty by offering large sums of money and raising soldiers from among the peasants on their estates; the most notable example being that of Prince Colonna who furnished a regiment of infantry of fourteen companies fully clothed and armed.

With the exception of the Emperor of Austria who sent one of his officers, Marshall Colli to take the command of the Papal army, the Catholic powers gave the Holy Father no assistance and by an incredible act of perfidy, while the Neapolitan envoy in Rome, the Marchese Del Vasto was negotiating an alliance between Naples and the Holy See, and promising the help of an army of 15000 men commanded by the King, the prime minister Acton ordered Prince Belmonte Pignatelli, the plenipotentiary in Paris, to conclude peace with the Directory, thus leaving the Holy Father completely isolated. It was a severe blow to Pius VI; but Ferdinand IV apparently repenting his action, wrote at once to the Directory that he feared that the peace would not last long if a republic were established on the frontiers of his kingdom, and that before ratifying the treaty he would wait until the inviolability of the Papal States was recognised. In reply, the Directors sent the King a vague assurance that they would do all in their power to maintain the tranquillity of the kingdom of Naples, and that the duration of the armistice with the Pope, would depend on the good faith with which its conditions should be observed by the Holy See.

General Bonaparte was then engaged in besieging Mantua, and hoped to carry the war against Austria into Tyrol; he must also have known that the irritation produced throughout Italy by the harshness of the French Commissioners towards Pius VI was such that if he were to experience the slightest defeat, the people would rise *en masse* and not a Frenchman should recross the Alps. He was, therefore, anxious for a peace which would have given him the money which he wanted, but the Holy See now declined to ask for peace and preferred to wait for the course of events; and when the general wrote to the Directory, to explain how impossible it was for him to lead an expedition against Rome, he expressed his displeasure

with their blundering diplomacy in beginning the negotiations for peace before the contributions demanded by the armistice of Bologna had been paid. As, nevertheless, the Directors were still obstinately determined to insist on the revocation of the briefs, and made no further attempt to come to an understanding, Mgr. Caleppi came back to Rome; but on October 28th, Bonaparte received full powers to negotiate with the Holy See, or to adopt hostile measures if he thought it necessary, provided he could reckon on the neutrality of Naples; and he instructed Cacault to request that a plenipotentiary should be sent to him for that purpose. Cardinal Busca, the Secretary of State, took no notice of his request for the Vatican could not discuss the question of the withdrawal of the briefs, and there was still some hope that a victory of the Austrians in the north of Italy would cause the retreat of the French and the restitution of the lost provinces. In the meanwhile preparations for defending Rome and what remained of the Papal States were actively continued; additional troops were raised and sent to the frontiers; on the Feast of the Epiphany, 1797, the Papal Standards bearing the Cross with the motto, *In hoc signo vinces* were solemnly blessed at St. Peter's; and on the 19th January, General Colli, sent by the Emperor to take the command of the Papal army, made a triumphal entry into Rome where he was received with enthusiasm by the people.

Cacault was still making vain attempts to enter into communication with the Vatican, which took no notice of his applications; but whilst he was complaining to the Directory that he had been waiting two months and a half for an answer, and that neither the Pope nor the Romans showed any signs of fear, Bonaparte seized at Mesola on January 10th a Venetian courier, bearing a letter dated January 7th from Cardinal Busca to Mgr. Albani, the Papal representative in Vienna, in which the Cardinal stated that the cession of Ferrara and Commacchio, which was the price demanded by Austria for an alliance, was out of the question; that as long as negotiations were being carried on at Vienna, he did not consider it honourable to treat with the French in spite of their threats, and of the efforts made to induce him to answer Cacault; and that the Directory was then intriguing with Spain, and offering to give Rome to the Duke of Parma in exchange for his Duchy; a measure which it was the interest of Austria to prevent.

Bonaparte was rendered furious by the discovery of this intended attack; he wrote to Cacault on January 22d to leave Rome within six hours; on the 1st of February he declared the armistice to be at end, and invaded the territory of the Holy See. On the 5th the Papal troops which defended the bridge over the Senio were defeat-



ed, Faenza and Ancona were taken without resistance Loreto was seized on the 9th, but the greater part of its treasures had already been removed to Rome, and when Bonaparte halted his army on the 16th at Tolentino, he was met there by the envoys sent by the Sovereign Pontiff to ask for peace. The plenipotentiaries were Cardinal Mattei, Mgr. Caleppi, Duke Braschii, the nephew of Pius VI, and Marquis Canillo Massini, along with Prince di Belmonte, the representative of Naples as mediator. Bonaparte had received full powers to treat, and he prudently put the religious question aside and made no demand for the withdrawal of the briefs, for he had no desire to excite a religious war in Italy by taking the defence of a schismatical Church which the Directory was then engaged in persecuting, and he was also anxious to avoid causing the intervention of the Neapolitan army, and return with as little delay as possible to the north of Italy after having plundered the States of the Church to the utmost of his power. M. Cacault had come to assist Bonaparte in the negotiations; he had learned from d'Azara that Emperor of Austria had refused to form an alliance with the Pope, and that the Cardinals in a consistory had decided on continuing the war; and both the general and the diplomatist, reckoning on the terror which the French army inspired, put forward the most exorbitant demands, while the Papal representatives were not allowed even three days to send to Rome to ask for further instructions. Bonaparte also reminded them that there could no longer be any question of the discussion of an ordinary peace but of the capitulation of a besieged city, for he considered Rome as being already in his power;<sup>31</sup> the dread of the devastation which would be caused in Rome by the invasion of a French army, at last induced the envoys to submit to the conqueror's will, and on February 19th, 1797 a peace was signed which was ratified by Pius VI on the 23d.

By this treaty the Sovereign Pontiff relinquished his rights to Avignon and to Contat Venaissin; to the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara and Ravenna, in favor of the French Republic, which was also allowed to occupy the towns and fortresses in the territory of Ancona until a Continental peace. He agreed to pay fifteen millions of *livres tournois*, of which ten millions were to be in coin and five millions in diamonds or other precious stones, to complete what still remained due of the amount promised by the armistice of Bologna; and besides that, another fifteen millions of *livres* in money or precious stones. The rare manuscripts and the works of art mentioned

---

<sup>31</sup> Mgr. Pietro Baldassari—*Relazione delle avversità e patimenti del glorioso Papa Pio VI.*, Roma, 1889, I., p. 129. (Mgr. Baldassari was Secretary to Mgr. Innico Diego Caracciolo, the *Maestro di Camera*, of Pius VI., and was, therefore, an eye witness of all the events which he relates.

in the armistice were also to be given up, and according as these clauses were executed, the French troops were to evacuate Umbria, and the provinces of Fano, Urbino and Macerata. Three hundred thousand *livres* were also to be paid as indemnity to those who had suffered any loss by the riot in which Bassville lost his life; all persons imprisoned for their political opinions were to be released, and the Holy Father was to renounce all offensive or defensive alliances against the Republic, and to refuse to give any assistance to its enemies or to receive their vessels into his ports.

The Papal Government spare no effort to collect the enormous amount of money exacted by the treaty; the works of art which had been sent to Terracina were brought back to Rome; a proclamation was issued calling on all Papal subjects to give up their jewelry and ornaments, and the Vatican was despoiled of its most valuable historical treasures. Among these were the gems which adorned the Papal chasubles and copes, some of which dated from the times of Innocent VIII, Julius II and Leo X; four tiaras which had belonged to Julius II, Paul III, Clement VII and Urban VIII; and the gold morse made by Benvenuto Cellini for Clement VII. The pearls and diamonds which had adorned the shrine of Loreto were also sacrificed, and before the 3d of June, 1797, Pius VI had paid 16,300,000 francs in coin, bullion, and bills, and 11,271,000 in precious stones; in all 28,071,000 francs. Even this did not satisfy the rapacity of the commissioner Haller, though Cacault sought in vain to check his insolence and dishonesty, for he insisted on having the jewels re-valued at Modena by a Jew who estimated them at a lower rate and he exacted a further contribution from the Holy Father to make up the deficit.

Although the Directory, which viewed the invasion of Italy chiefly as a means of replenishing their treasury, would have been willing to give back Lombardy to Austria after it had been drained of all its wealth in exchange for Belgium, Bonaparte preferred to form it into a republic under the name of *la Repubblica Cisalpina* with Milan as its capital, which should be a menace to the States of the Pope, of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and of the Duke of Parma, by keeping alive there a feeling of unrest, and a spirit of discontent, of which he might take advantage whenever he might wish to overthrow those governments. He then founded another at Modena, named *la Repubblica Cispadana* of which Reggio, Bologna and Ferrara formed part; it was united to the *Cisalpine* on July 18th, 1797, and the new republic was given a constitution similar to that of France with an Executive composed of five Directors, and a Legislature formed by two Councils.

The destruction of the Papacy and the establishment of a Republic in Rome had long been desired by the Directory who had sent emissaries there with that object, although Cacault, a man whose views were much more moderate than theirs, had begged of them not to encourage the Roman Revolutionists, as there was not enough of the Republican spirit in Rome to create a Republic, and whatever discontent existed, was directed against the French whom the people detested for carrying away their money and their artistic treasures.

The prudent advice of Cacault and also that of Talleyrand, then minister of foreign affairs, two experienced diplomatists would seem to have somewhat subdued the ardent Jacobinism of the Directors, for, when Joseph Bonaparte replaced Cacault as ambassador in Rome, he was not instructed to prepare the way for a Republic, but to defend the interests of the Directory in case Pius VI died and a Conclave were held for the election of his successor. This more moderate policy was also that of his brother, the general, who said to Cardinal Mattei at the signature of the peace of Tolentina, "If I were the master, we should have a Concordat tomorrow;" for he saw the necessity of pacifying France and that the Catholics, by whom he did not wish to be considered as an enemy of the Church, were gradually regaining power. Nevertheless Joseph Bonaparte brought with him to Rome a list of 35 persons, mostly lawyers and doctors together with a few nobles on whom he could reckon in case of any movement against the Papal Government, and the Palazzo Corsini, where he lived, soon became the meeting place of all the disaffected in Rome.

After the *coup d'état* in Paris, on the 18th Fructidor (4th September, 1797) by the more Conservative section of the two Councils and the more moderate members of the Directory, Barthelemy and Carnot were proscribed and deported, a more hostile policy towards the Holy Father was adopted by Rewbell, Barras and La Revelliere-Lepeaux who represented the intolerant and Jacobin party among Directors, for on October 10th Talleyrand wrote in their name to Joseph Bonaparte not to discourage the good dispositions of those who believed that it was time that the rule of the Popes should come to an end, but rather to encourage the aspirations towards liberty which the Roman people was apparently manifesting. General Bonaparte too laid aside the friendliness he had sometimes shown towards the Vatican; either because he felt that he had lost the influence he had had with the Directory with which he did not wish to quarrel, or because he was irritated by the refusal of the Holy See to acknowledge the Cisalpine Republic, as well as by the nomination of the Austrian General Provera to the command of the Papal army, and he also suspected that there was an alliance between the Pope and the



King of Naples. He therefore wrote to his brother on September 29th at a time when Pius VI was dangerously ill, that if the Pope were to die, he should do all in his power to prevent the election of another and to bring about a revolution, and the Directory approved of these instructions in a letter to the General from La Revelliere on October 21st, 1797.

In spite of the treaty of Tolentino, the Directory still continued to aim at the overthrow of the temporal power of the Holy See, by exciting insurrections in the towns which still remained subject to the Pope. Thus on November 19th the town of Ancona proclaimed itself an independent republic without any opposition from the French garrison, and the troops of the Cisalpine Republic consisting chiefly of Polish refugees and deserters occupied Rimini and Cesena. The Cisalpine Government even sent an ultimatum to Rome, demanding that the Holy See should recognise their Republic within eight days under pain of a declaration of war; but though the Papal Government yielded immediately to this request (25th November) the invasion still continued. The fortress of San Leo was seized on December 2d, Pesaro and Fano rose and established provisional Governments on the 22d, while Sinigallia, Macereta and Vinno were occupied by detachments of French soldiers from the garrison of Ancona, and Republican Governments were at once proclaimed in all these towns.

The Republican party in Rome had also sought on more than one occasion to excite an insurrection, and had even tried to blow up the Castle of St. Angelo on June 28, but were foiled in all their attempts. The French Government, however, openly took the defence of those **whom the Papal police arrested for these crimes, and Joseph Bonaparte** was instructed to demand the release of the prisoners, among whom were three men who had been accused of intending to assassinate the Pope; though, indeed, the Directory consented to allow these men to be expelled from Rome for some time, "until their presence should become necessary, when they might be brought back cautiously."<sup>32</sup> For the Directors, much as they desired to overthrow the Papal Government and plunder Rome, could not do so openly as they did not wish to incur the risk of a war with Naples which might also bring on a renewal of the hostilities with Austria; but to afford the revolutionists some assistance, a band of ardent Jacobin agitators, among whom were three adjutants-general, Avighi, Sherlock, and Duphot, was sent to Rome, and the last named is known to have had interviews with the leaders of the Republican party.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Sciout—*Histoire du Directoire*, III., 257.

<sup>33</sup> Augusto Franchetti, *Storia politica d'Italia*, Milano, 1881, P. 304.

An attempt at a rising took place at last on the night of December 27th, when a crowd of sixty or one hundred insurgents, after a banquet in the Villa Medici on the Pincian Hill, came down the Via Sistina, led by the sculptor Ceracchi and a notary named Agretti with the intention of planting trees of liberty and calling on the people to revolt;<sup>34</sup> but they were dispersed by a patrol of dragoons and fled, leaving behind them their tricolour flags and cockades. During the following day money and tricolour cockades were distributed by the conspirators among the people in the poorer quarters of Rome, without, however, causing any disturbance; but in the afternoon a band of insurgents led by two Frenchmen, attacked the barracks occupied by a detachment of Papal troops near Ponte Sisto. They were driven away by a patrol of cavalry and the officer in command of the guard stationed an advanced post of a few soldiers under the Porta Settimiana, an archway which crossed the Lungara not far from the Palazzo Corsini, with orders to allow no persons in arms to pass, while the cavalry, accompanied by some of the foot soldiers, pursued the fugitives firing on them, towards the Embassy where they took refuge. Joseph Bonaparte accompanied by Generals Duphot and Sherlock, in uniform and with their swords drawn, came out to calm the disturbance, and ordered the soldiers to withdraw; they obeyed; but General Duphot rushed forward at the head of the insurgents, with the cry of "*Viva la Liberta*" towards the Porta Settimiana where the soldiers of the advanced post seeing themselves in danger of being surrounded by the armed mob, fired a volley beneath which he fell, and the rioters fled back to the palace in disorder.

Cardinal Doria the recently named secretary of State alarmed by the dangerous consequences which he foresaw would result from this unfortunate event, wrote at once to the ambassador to express his regret, but was unable to appease his indignation or to dissuade him from leaving Rome on the following morning, while the Directors on learning of the death of Duphot, arrested the Papal representative in Paris, Marquis Massini and seized his papers. They then prepared to put in execution their long cherished plan of destroying the temporal power of the Papacy by a sudden attack upon Rome; precautions were taken to guard against intervention on the part of Austria or Naples by assuring them that the Directory had no intention of seizing Rome, or inflicting any injury on religion, but desired merely to avenge the outrage offered to France in such a way that it should not be repeated. What the Directors really sought to guard against was an attempt on the part of these Catholic powers to assert the hardly veiled pretensions which their diplomatists had al-

---

<sup>34</sup> Baldassari, I., p. 270.

ready put forward to a share of the States of the Church as compensation for the aggrandisement of France and the foundation of the Cisalpine Republic.

General Berthier then in command of the French army in Italy was charged with the organisation of an expedition against Rome for which General Bonaparte sent him very detailed instructions, with regard to the disposition of his troops so as to guard against a sudden invasion of the Austrians in his rear. He was also to advance with the utmost secrecy and with the greatest haste so as to reach Rome before the Neapolitan army should be able to intervene; and when at two days march from Rome he was to threaten the Pope and his Ministers so as to fill them with terror and drive them to take flight. When in Rome, he was to employ all his influence to establish a Republic, but to avoid whatever might tend to prove that the Government had formed such a project. Berthier who accepted with much displeasure what Bonaparte termed "the honour of taking Rome," left Ancona at the end of January, after issuing a proclamation which declared that his expedition had no other object than to punish the murderers of Duphot. His army, numbering 14,696 men, mostly unshod, badly fed, and without pay, encountered no opposition, with the exception of a rising of the peasantry near the town of Gesi which was soon suppressed, as the Papal troops had been ordered to fall back without resistance. While on his march, the General received a letter from Cardinal Doria stating that a friendly power was about to offer its mediation and requesting him to stop his advance, but he gave no reply to it. At Terni on February 7th, Berthier had an interview with Prince Belmonte the Neapolitan ambassador in Rome whom he assured that France would be satisfied with a humble apology, and that he would state the demands of the Directory when the French army should have reached the walls of Rome; but he refused to receive Cardinal della Somaglia, Mgr. Arrigoni and Prince Giustiniani whom Pius VI had sent to ascertain the conditions which he intended to impose. On the 9th Berthier reached La Storta about 10 miles from Rome while his advanced guard under General Servoni, a Corsican, occupied Monte Mario, the hill which commands the approach to Rome by the Ponte Molle, and where on the following day he established his headquarters.

General Berthier then sent for Cavaliere d'Azara and charged him to inform the Holy Father that as soon as the Castle of Saint Angelo should be given up to the French, he would state what was the satisfaction demanded by the Republic, and that the entrance of the French troops into Rome would not be of a hostile character, pro-



vided the people did not insult them. The Castle was surrendered at once, as Pius VI knew that it was useless to resist, though he placed no confidence in Berthier's assurances. Still, no republican movement took place in Rome and Berthier wrote despairingly to Bonaparte, that Rome was in a state of the utmost consternation; he had not found a trace of the spirit of liberty; he had been visited by only one patriot who had offered to set free 2000 galley slaves, and that it was easy to imagine how he had reached such a suggestion.

The principal conditions imposed by General Berthier which were made known to the Holy Father after the occupation of the Castle of St. Angelo by the French, were, that twelve hostages, among whom were four Cardinals and four Roman princes, were to be given up; several members of the Council of State were to be dismissed, and thirteen persons known to be hostile to the French, two of whom were Cardinals, were to be arrested and sent to the General within 24 hours. The Papal army was to be disbanded, with the exception of the Swiss guard and 500 infantry, a war tax of four millions of piastres in coin, and two millions of piastres in kind, was to be paid within thirty days, and three thousand horses were to be furnished for the use of the army within ten days. Everything belonging to the Governments at war with France or to their subjects was to be confiscated, and all the paintings, statues, books, manuscripts and works of art which a commission named for that purpose should judge worthy of being transported into France, were to be carried away. On the places where Bassville and Duphot had been assassinated, monuments were to be raised, bearing inscriptions recording both the crime committed and the satisfaction which had been exacted for it. Religion and its ministers, as well as the Churches and all private persons and their property would be respected. The French army was to march to the Capitol and there do homage to the great men who had rendered the Roman republic illustrious.

This convention, or rather capitulation, was signed on the part of Pius VI, by Prince Gabrielli and Giustiniani and on the 11th the advanced guard of the Republican army entered Rome and occupied several commanding positions; but General Berthier still remained in his camp on Monte Mario, waiting, as he confessed to the Directory, until he had organized the people into making a demonstration which was to ask him to grant them liberty. It took some days to do so; for the Roman Jacobins had perceived that they were not supported by the majority of the people, and the attitude of Joseph Bonaparte towards them had not been sufficiently frank to make them feel certain that France was resolved to support them in their rebellion against the Holy See. They therefore hesitated to declare themselves until Berthier had taken some decisive steps to convince

them of what were his real intentions. The demonstration which he required to enable him to throw off the mask was organised by an apostate priest, Jean Bassal, who had been constitutional parish priest at Versailles; then a member of the Convention, and President of the Society of Jacobins, and who along with his accomplices, by means of various false assertions, obtained signatures to a petition, which Berthier accepted as a proof of the desire of the Roman people for a Republic.

At last, on February 15th, the twenty third anniversary of the election of Pius VI while the Cardinals were assisting at Mass in the Sistine Chapel, a crowd of about three hundred patriots assembled at the foot of the Capitol on the Campo Vaccino, the site of the Roman forum where a numerous body of French troops commanded by Murat was drawn up. At the same time the leaders of the movement met on the square of the Capitol where, in presence of General Cervoni, they planted in front of the Statue of Marcus Aurelius, a tree of liberty decorated with the black, white and red tricolour flags of the new republic, and three notaries drew up in the name of the Roman people a manifesto which proclaimed its sovereignty and independence. A long list of functionaries, beginning with seven consuls named by Servoni, followed this document, and a deputation of which Duke Bonelli and Duke Sporza-Cesarini formed part was then sent to request Berthier to enter Rome. The general accompanied by a brilliant staff, came to the Capitol, where he made a speech in which he invoked the shades of Pompey and of Cato, of Brutus and of Cicero, and declared that the sons of the Gauls had come with the olive branch of peace to rebuild the altars of Liberty on the spot where they had been raised by the first Brutus; but in a few days he changed the provisional government, keeping only five of the seven Consuls, and appointing Bassal nominally as their secretary, but in reality as their master.

That evening General Cervoni came to the Vatican; Pius VI had already retired to rest but rose to give him audience, and his venerable and majestic appearance so overawed the General that he apologised in an embarrassed and hesitating manner for having come as the bearer of disagreeable intelligence. Being encouraged by the Holy Father to proceed, Cervoni was saying that the exercise of the Catholic religion had been guaranteed and that the spiritual power of the Head of the Church would remain free and intact, when he was interrupted by the Pope who said "that Spiritual power was given us by God and no human authority can take it from us." Cervoni then informed him that the Republican Government of Rome was under the protection of France, that Berthier would support it with his army, and that His Holiness had ceased to be a temporal sovereign.

He would still however be allowed to keep his guards, and the Roman Republic would provide for his subsistence. To these vague promises the Sovereign Pontiff merely replied that he humbly submitted to the inscrutable decree of Providence; that the good faith and the sincerity which he had always shown towards France ought to have withheld from his lips the bitter cup which he had been made to drink to the lees; but that he was consoled by the testimony of his conscience and by his confidence in the protection of God, and that he hoped that the Catholic religion would be respected, and that the blood of those who had served his government zealously and honourably, should not be shed.

The cavalry who had formed the Papal Guard and the soldiers who had been promised by Berthier, were disarmed and dismissed almost immediately; the French occupied the Vatican, and then handed it over to men of the civic guard which they had just formed out of the dregs of the populace, whose drunken cries and licentious songs resounded through the palace. The revolutionary party hoped by these insults and humiliations to wear out the patience of Pius VI and to oblige him to ask to leave Rome, as they dreaded the effect which the forcible expulsion of the Holy Father might have on the minds of the people, but he was determined not to leave Rome of his own free will.

On the 17th the Swiss Calvinist, Rodolph Haller, the treasurer-general of the French army whose duty it was to collect the forced contributions imposed on Italy, and who had organized for that purpose a body of "Agents for the seizure of Church plate," a man who was despised and looked upon as a robber by the revolutionists themselves, came with thirteen of his subordinates to the Vatican which he visited minutely and plundered without mercy, everywhere placing the seal of the French Republic. He seized the Pope's private library of 40,000 volumes which the Holy Father intended to leave to his native town, Ceneda; he seized his collection of precious objects and works of art which had been given or bequeathed to him during his reign, and threatened to break open the doors which were not unlocked at once. Entering then the room where the Holy Father was breakfasting, and seizing a small box on the table, he asked insolently if it contained diamonds, but the Pope replied that it held only biscuits and courteously offered them to him. As he was convinced that there were many jewels still concealed in the Vatican, he obliged the Holy Father to open all the presses in his bedroom, although assured that all the precious stones from Loreto and much besides had already been given up. Haller also tried to persuade the Sovereign Pontiff to leave Rome, telling him roughly



that the Roman Republic wanted his palace; that he ran great danger of being the victim of some popular tumult, and that he would do well to provide for his safety by a speedy departure. But the Holy Father replied that he had no reason to fear the people; that his safety had just been publicly guaranteed; and that he would never leave the Vatican voluntarily. That evening, however, by General Berthier's orders, Cardinal Doria informed the Holy Father that both the French and Roman authorities insisted that he should quit Rome without delay, as otherwise he should be carried away forcibly in the custody of a French officer, and yielding to the Cardinal's advice he consented to leave, and fixed upon Florence as his future place of residence. Any attempt to escape in the meanwhile was impossible, as the two rooms which were all that was left to the Holy Father, were watched by sentinels at the doors who allowed no one to have access to him without the permission of the officer on guard in the anti-chamber.

The necessary precautions had already been taken by the Sovereign Pontiff to provide for the safety and legality of the election of his successor, for after the death of General Duphot and the departure of Joseph Bonaparte he had foreseen the dangers which the Holy See was probably destined to encounter, and he therefore decreed by a Bull dated 30th December, 1797, that the Cardinals present in Rome at the time of his death should at once decide by the votes of the majority in what place it would be convenient to hold the Conclave; and also, in case of any popular tumult or war taking place, to advance or retard the date of its opening, instead of waiting until the tenth day after the death of the Pope according to the usual custom.

About an hour before dawn on the morning of February 20th, in foggy, rainy weather, while the streets of Rome and the road leading from the Porta Angelica to the Ponte Molle were patrolled by numerous detachments of cavalry and infantry, Pius VI left the Vatican accompanied by Mgr. Caracciolo his "*maestro di camera*," Mgr. Giuseppe Rossi, his doctor; Father Maroti, a former Jesuit, his secretary, as well as sixteen other members of his household, and escorted by two majors of the French army and a squadron of dragoons. On the previous day eleven thousand Roman crowns had been given to the Holy Father by the Republican Government, and it was all that he ever received from it, although it had promised to provide for his subsistence.

As soon as the Sovereign Pontiff had left Rome, the plunder of the Vatican by Haller and his agents began. The sacristies of the Papal chapels were robbed of their chalices, crosses and illuminated

missals, as well as of two jewelled mitres and several richly embroidered vestments, which had been carefully concealed, until a faithless servant revealed their hiding place. These were burned for the sake of the gold and silver they contained, and the same fate befell one of the celebrated tapestries designed by Raphael which were sold to a Genoese Jew. All the linen of the palace and even the kitchen utensils and the locks of the doors were also carried off. Masons were employed to sound the walls of the palace lest other treasures might be concealed there. The Vatican library lost its precious collections of cameos, coins and medals, only a few of which were restored after the fall of Napoleon. The same devastation took place in the Churches, monasteries and convents of Rome, either then or in the course of a few months; in some places even tombs were broken open in order to obtain the leaden coffins they held, and if those of the Popes were spared, it was because it was feared that the expense of breaking them open would be greater than the profit to be derived from them.

As in spite of the enormous sums which had been plundered not only from the public treasuries but also from the wealthy inhabitants in every town which the Republican armies had invaded, the French soldiers were still in rags, unshod and without pay since five months, serious mutinies had taken place in Mantua and other towns of the north of Italy and had only been appeased by exhorting more money from the conquered countries. In Rome the arrival of Massena, who was accused of being the most rapacious of all the generals, to replace Berthier was the signal for a revolt of all the officers under the rank of major, who protested against the shameless system of plundering carried on by their superiors and the agents of the Government, to lead a life of scandalous luxury, while the officers and soldiers were in the utmost misery, and they insisted on being paid within twenty four hours and on the restitution of all that had been stolen from private houses and from the Churches belonging to Powers which were at peace with France.

While the generals were vainly attempting to appease the indignation of their officers and restore discipline, the inhabitants of the poorer quarters of Rome, the Trastevere, the Monti, and the Regola rose in arms on the night of February 25th, to the cry of "*Viva il Papa*," but the insurrection was suppressed by General Berthier after four hours fighting, and twenty two of the rebels were shot on the following days in the Piazza del Popolo.

The mutiny of the officers was ended by the substitution of General Gouvion Saint Cyr for Massena, and the payment of a portion of the arrears due to the soldiers; but the example of the people of the

Trasteverc was followed in many of the small towns near Rome: at Albano, L'Ariceia, Genzano and Velletri, the peasantry took arms and marched towards Rome to the number of seven or eight thousand until met by a French column commanded by Murat who defeated them with great loss. Other insurrections soon followed caused by the exactions of the French troops and the seizure of the Church plate by the Commissioner of the Roman Republic; that at the end of April in the mountains round Lake Trasimene was only suppressed after a desperate resistance; and though the risings at Orvieto and in the villages round Ascoli, were not of much importance, a much more serious revolt took place in July in the Hermician mountains and the plain at their feet, where Ferentino and Frosinone guarded by their ancient walls, and Terracina protected by the surrounding woods and marshes, were after a stubborn defence, taken at the point of the bayonet by the Polish troops in the service of the Cisalpine Republic, which had been sent to the assistance of the Roman Government.

But in Rome, the expulsion of the religious orders from their monasteries and convents, and the sale of Church property was carried on unmercifully, though checked for a short space of time by the invasion of the Neapolitan army.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

---

## MEDIAEVAL COURTESY.

IN an age when it is constantly thought, and frequently said, that chivalry is dead, courtesy dying, and good manners dead and buried in the past, it may not be amiss to take a peep into the middle ages when courtesy was an art if not a science, whose principles formed a considerable part of the education of the youth of the nobility and gentry.

There is no lack of material left to show us how our ancestors behaved to each other; how the young treated the old and were treated by them; how servants served their masters; how the tables of the rich were appointed; how they carved, how they ate and drank; how they comported themselves at table; how they dressed; how, in short, the machinery of daily life was oiled, and how it worked. Rather is there an "embarras de richesses" among the various "Books of Nurture" and "Books of Courtesy" which remain to us and have been edited and published by the Early English Text Society.



Of these the three oldest are "Stans Puer ad Mensam," attributed to Lydgate, date 1430. "How the Good Wife taught her Daughter," and the companion, but inferior, poem, "How the Wise Man taught his Son," of about the same date, 1430, though it is possible "The Wise Man" may be much older. The "Book of Courtesy" from the Sloane MS. is rather later, from 1430 to 1440. The MS. of John Russell's "Book of Nurture," sometimes thought to be an older work touched up and edited by him, instead of an original composition, is considered to date about 1460 to 1470. The "Babees Book," perhaps the most popular of all, bears date about 1475, and "The Young Children's Book," a few years later, 1480. The oldest extant edition of Wynkyn de Worde's "Book of Carving" is 1858. Hugh Rhode's "Book of Nurture" was first printed in 1554, and Seager's "School of Virtue" a few years later, 1557.

Thus the period dealt with in these various works ranges over a century and a half, and probably longer, as the original MSS. of the earlier ones may be still more ancient than 1430. With the exception of the "Book of Carving," and two or three chapters of Rhodes's "Book of Nurture," all these treatises were written in verse, that they might the more easily be committed to memory.

It was the custom as far back as the 12th century, among the upper classes in England, to send their sons and daughters to the houses of other nobles or gentlemen, to learn to read and write, to talk French and Latin, and especially, and before all else, to learn manners and courtesy, the art of carving, and a knowledge of the rules of precedence; and these three last items were considered the most important part of the education of the nobility and gentry.

This same system of bringing up prevailed also among what we should call the lower middle classes, where the young were sent away from home to learn some trade, and to live meanwhile with their masters, to whom they were bound as apprentices, and a very hard time they had of it, for they were servants as well as apprentices, though in due course they became masters.

These Books of Courtesy, however, were intended for the use of the upper classes, between whom and the people the line of demarcation was much more strongly marked then than at present, when all classes shade upwards into each other, each striving to be in the one above it.

Yet Society was really more knit together then than now,

when money is the only medium of exchange between employer and employed; in the olden times, when old feudal customs prevailed, and the tenants had to fight for their liege-lords, and labor was paid in land, or in kind, or in meals taken so many times a week, at the baronial hall, below the salt, rich and poor were much more dependent on each other, and the bonds between them were much stronger than at present.

The first thing that strikes a reader who dips for the first time into one of these old Books of Nurture, is not how well the people behaved at table in those days, when they learnt so much about manners, but how villainously, if such instructions, some of which are quite impossible to quote, were necessary.

It is rather a comfort in what some would have us believe to be our degenerate days, to find that disgusting manners and customs, such as we cannot conceive a ploughman would be guilty of now, actually then prevailed among the aristocracy to such an extent that the young had to be taught to avoid them.

The fact that similar instructions are given in all the books, shows that the customs alluded to above must have been pretty general, and the authors took care to call a spade a spade; there are no veiled allusions; they left us no doubt as to their meaning.

But if on the one hand we have certainly improved in our manners at table, and our personal habits, as we shall presently see, on the other hand, in more important matters, such as the conduct of children to parents, of servants to masters, and in mutual courtesy in our social relations we have to confess we have deteriorated to such an extent that many of the instructions here given seem to us to be ridiculous and laughable, rather than praiseworthy and to be imitated.

In the present day parents and masters and mistresses err perforce on the side of leniency; in the Middle Ages they erred on the side of severity; and this plan of sending their children to other people to bring up alienated the affection of both children and parents from each other, as complained of in some works of the time.

Very harsh treatment was meted out to girls as well as to boys; grown up girls were beaten sometimes by their mothers, and pinching and nipping were favorite methods of correction; boys were cruelly beaten by their schoolmasters, servants and apprentices by their masters; flogging was looked upon rather as a virtue, and is highly recommended in some of these old books.

"The Good Wife" taught her daughter to beat her children

well if they were rebellious, in the following lines: (slightly modernized)

"And if thy children shall rebel, and will not to thee bow,"  
 "If any of them do wrong, neither ban them nor blow," (strike)  
 "But take a smart rod, and beat them in a row,"  
 "Till they cry mercy, and learn their guilt to know."<sup>1</sup>

The author of "Stans Puer ad Mensam" holds similar views to the "Good Wife" on the virtue of corporal punishment, and says when children quarrel and complain, let the parent pay no heed to their complaints, but punish them:

"To their complaints give no credence,"  
 "A rod reformeth all their negligence;"  
 "In their courage no rancour does abide,"  
 "Who that spareth the rod all virtues sets aside."

Hugh Rhodes, who wrote a hundred and twenty-five years later, is more merciful, and though he advises severity, yet he recommends that it be tempered with mercy, when he cautions parents to choose for their children such schoolmasters:

"As fear God and live virtuously, such as can punish sharply,  
 "with patience, and not with rigour, for it doth oft-times make  
 "them to rebel and run away, whereof chanceth oft-times much  
 "harm."<sup>2</sup>

Rhodes must have been of a very gentle nature himself, as he is at great pains to inculcate gentleness and politeness, as well as reverence to parents.

"Unto your elders gentle be,"  
 "'Gainst them say no harm."

\* \* \*

"Reverence to thy parents dear  
 "duty doth thee bind;  
 "Such children as (in) virtue delight,"  
 "Be gentle, meek and kind;"  
 "Against thy parents multiply"  
 "no words, but be demure."  
 "It will redound unto thy praise,"  
 "and to thy friends pleasure."

It was the custom for children to bow and courtesy to their parents, and to kneel and ask their blessing if they had been away for any time. Thus Seager in "The School of Virtue," says:

<sup>1</sup> How the Good Wife taught her daughter, line 188-192.

<sup>2</sup> The Book of Nurture, p. 14. Ibid lines, 27-48.



"When that thy parents come in sight,"

"do them reverence;"

"Ask them blessing if they have"

"been long out of presence."<sup>3</sup>

It appears inferiors knelt on one knee before superiors, for in "The Babees Book" the author telling the Babies how to enter their lord's place, says:

"Hold up your head, and kneel but on one knee,"

"To your sovereign, or lord whether he be."<sup>4</sup>

and in the "Book of Courtesy," (Sloane MS.) the reader is counselled to:

"Be courteous to God, and kneel down,"

"On both knees with great devotion;"

"To man thou shalt kneel upon the one,"

"The other, to thyself thou hold alone."<sup>5</sup>

In Seager's "School of Virtue" children are taught on returning from school to say good-bye, at the door of their home, to their companions, and:

"The house then entering, in thy parent's presence,"

"Humbly salute them, with all reverence."

This is the latest of the "Books of Courtesy," but here two directions are given to children to wait upon their parents at table, and if they were big enough, to bring in the dishes:

"When thy parents down to the table shall sit,"

"In place be ready for the purpose most fit;"

"With sober countenance looking them in the face,"

"Thy hands holding up, begin this grace."

\* \* \*

"Grace being said, low curtesy make thou,"

"Saying, much good may it do you."

words which evidently bore a different meaning then from the ironical sense in which we use them.

"Of stature then, if thou be able,"

"It shall become thee to serve the table;"

"In bringing to it such meat as shall need"

"For thy parents upon that time to feed."

"Dishes with measure thou oughtest to fill,"

"Else mayst thou happen thy service to spill."

"On their apparel or else on the cloth,"

"Which for to do would move them to wrath."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Rhodes's Book of Nurture.

<sup>4</sup> Babees Book, line 63-4.

<sup>5</sup> The Book of Courtesy, Sloane MS. line 63-63.

<sup>6</sup> Seager's "School of Virtue," 330-344.

This last contingency seems exceedingly probable in days when such mishaps were treated as serious faults, and probably met with severe punishment.

After instructing his readers how to wait at table, the curtesy is again mentioned as a duty, much in the way country people will still tell their children to "make their duty" to their superiors, in some counties.

"All things thus done, forget not thy duty,"

"Before the table make thou low curtesy."<sup>7</sup>

Hugh Rhodes, in his "School of Good Manners," a part of his "Book of Nurture," urges the same act of obeisance at the end of dinner; after saying "Much good may it do ye," which appears to have been the regular formula at the close of a meal, he tells the child:

"Then go to your Sovereign,"

"Give him obeisance duly;"

"That done, withdraw thyself aside,"

"At no time prove unruly."

This expression so frequently used, of "Sovereign" as applied to the master, who might be of noble birth, perhaps, but was not a king, shows in what reverence superiors were then held, and what sovereign rights they exercised over their dependents.

In many cases the boys who served at table were of as high rank as their "sovereigns" or their "lords," but they were not allowed to sit down in their presence, nor in that of their parents, until bidden to do so, even at table.

In all the books this attitude of standing is insisted on, and as we have seen, it gives the title to one book. Even the "Babees" of tender age, "whom blood royal with grace, feature and high ability hath adorned," are told to take no seat till commanded to do so, but to be ready to stand<sup>8</sup> and serve their lords, with clean hands, till the time comes for them to sit down to their own meal.

In the "Young Children's Book" the same rule is given:

"Stand, and sit not forth-withal,"

"Till he bids thee, that rules the hall;"

"Where he bids, there must thou sit,"

"And for none other change nor flit."

"Sit upright, and honestly,"

"Eat and drink, and be fellowly," (sociable)

"Share with them that sit thee by"

"That teaches thee Dame courtesy."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, 420-421.

<sup>8</sup> The Babies Book, lines 78-9.

<sup>9</sup> The Young Children's Book, 93-6.

To take the seat assigned to them is insisted on in "*Stans Puer ad Mensam*," and there they are also cautioned not to lean against a post or stare.

"Sit thou in that place thou art assigned to."

"Be simple in cheer, cast not thy look aside,"

"Gaze not about, turning thy sight over all,"

"Against the post, let not thy back abide,"

"Neither make thy mirror also of the wall."<sup>10</sup>

Hugh Rhodes, who seems to have been a clerk or chaplain of the King's Chapel, and probably write his book primarily for the gentlemen and boys of the king's chapel, devotes a whole chapter to the rules of precedence and carefully directs his clients on no account to go up higher than the place appointed to them.

"And of this thing beware, I wish,"

"Press not thyself too high;"

"Sit in the place appointed thee,"

"For that is courtesy."<sup>11</sup>

Apparently it was the custom for these boys for whom Rhodes wrote, to wear their caps during meals, and they were to remove them and stand, when spoken to by their masters.

"And if thy master speaks to thee,"

"Take thy cap in thy hand;"

"If thou sit at meat when he talketh"

"To thee, see thou stand."

"Lean not aside when thou shalt speak,"

"Upright be thou standing;"

"Hold still thy hands, move not thy feet,"

"Beware thou of trifling."<sup>12</sup>

We find similar instructions with regard to standing quietly, without leaning or staring; and as to sitting where told to sit, in the "*Book of Courtesy*, Sloane MS."

"Also, if thou have a lord,"

"And standest before him at the board,"

"While that thou speakest, keep well thy hand,"

"Thy foot also, in peace let stand."

"Gaze not on walls with thine eye,"

"Far nor near, low nor high."

"Before thy lord no mouths thou make,"

"If thou wilt courtesy with thee take."

"Look thou sit—and make no strife—"

"Where thou art commanded, or else thy wife."

<sup>10</sup> *Stans Puer ad Mensam*, 8-12.

<sup>11</sup> Rhodes' *Book of Nurture*, 134-136.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid*, 142-150.



Evidently this striving after a high place at table was a common fault, for we find it alluded to in all these books. Seager, whose "School of Virtue" is rather more religious in tone than the other books, though all are pious works, says:

"Presume not too high, I say, in no case,"

"In sitting down, to thy betters give place."

"Suffer each man, first served to be,"

"For that is a point of good courtesy."

It was the custom during the period over which these books extend, to wash the hands before and after eating at table; and in large households a good deal of ceremony attended the function. It was the duty of those who waited to bring the basin and ewer and towel to their "sovereign," or lord, or parents, before and after the meal. There was a cloth or upper towel on purpose to spread over the table-cloth during the washing, which was called the "sur-nape," and was like the side-slips which were in fashion some years ago, that were removed before dessert.

In Russell's "Book of Nurture," which is the most valuable for its record of table manners of the period, elaborate directions are given for the folding and laying of this sur-nape, which the marshall was to slip along the table, and after it was finished with, the chamberlain was to remove it with both his arms, and carry it back to the ewery.

John Russell, be it said, was usher to a royal prince, Duke Humfrey, of Gloucester, and his book is a guide to the duties of the Butler, Footman, Valet, Carver, Taster, Server, or Arranger of Dishes, Hippocras-maker, Usher, and Marshall of the Noblemen of the period, so his instructions as to the ritual of this hand-washing are very elaborate.

In the "Babees Book" the ceremony is simplified:

"Now must I tell in short, for I must so,"

"Your observance that ye shall do at noon;"

"When that ye see your lord to meat shall go,"

"Be ready to fetch him water soon."

"Some pour water; some hold till he hath done,"

"The cloth to him, and from him do not pace"

"Whilst he be set, and have heard said grace."<sup>13</sup>

And again at the end of dinner the "Babees" are bidden, some to fetch water, some to pour it over their lord's hands, and some to hold the towel.

In the Sloane "Book of Courtesy" directions for washing the lord's hands, both before and after dinner are given in the Third

<sup>13</sup> The Babees Book, 127-133.

Book, which was written for the servants in the courts of great noblemen.

The Ewerer first pours water into two basins and folds a towel "with full great lore" on the top of the upper one; the water is then "assayed," which seems to mean here, poured into a cup of white wood by the carver and "tasted." Two knights then hold the towel "before the lord's sleeves, that be so dear," which is an allusion to the elaborate, long and fantastically cut sleeves of the period. One knight holds the upper basin, while the carver pours water into the lower, apparently through the upper.

"For a pipe there is inside so clean"

"That water devoids of silver sheen,"

"Then sets he the lower, I understand,"

"In the other, and voids with both his hands."<sup>14</sup>

The whole of this passage is obscure, but it seems to mean: The lord held his hands between the two basins, while the carver poured water through the clean and shining pipe of the upper one into the lower.

The tasting or "assaying" of food and water was to discover poison if there had been any foul play, and was only done for the highest ranks down to an earl.

After dinner the sur-nape and a broad and narrow towel were spread before the lord and lady and after they had washed their hands and grace had been said, these were removed.

In the "Young Children's Book" the child is directed to wash his own hands before he leaves the table.

"And sit thou still, what so befall,"

"Till grace be said unto the end;"

"And till thou have washen with thy friend."

"Let the more worthy than thou"

"Wash before thee, and that is thy prow" (duty)

"And spit not in the basin,"

"My sweet son, that thou washest in."<sup>15</sup>

In "Stans Puer ad Mensam" the boy is directed, not without reason if the boy of 1430 resembled him of 1905, to wash his hands and clean his nails before he comes to table, and Hugh Rhodes gives the same advice:

"Before that you do sit, see that"

"Your knives be made bright,"

' Your hands clean, your nails pared;"

"It is a goodly sight."<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Sloane's Book of Courtesy, lines 696-720.

<sup>15</sup> The Young Children's Book, 82-88.

<sup>16</sup> Book of Nurture, 169-173.

Perhaps it was also somewhat a rare one, as it was evidently one devoutly to be desired.

Seager in his "School of Virtue," anticipates that the towel may be wanting, which suggests that perhaps the custom of washing at table was falling into disuse, when he wrote, or it may be only because he wrote for simpler households, where the children served the parents. When they have cleared the table he tells them:

"A clean towel then on the table spread,"  
 "The towel wanting, the cloth take instead,"  
 "And basin and ewer to the table bring,"  
 "In place convenient their pleasure abiding."  
 "When thou shalt see them ready to wash,"  
 "The ewer take up, and be not too rash."  
 "In pouring out water more than will suffice."  
 "The table then void that they may rise."

Knives seem to have been very inferior articles in those days, for all these authors direct, that the knives be not only cleaned, but sharpened, before they are brought to table.

The "Babees" are enjoined to keep their knives sharp and clean, and not to cut their meat like farm-labourers, who reckon not how they hack their food; and when the meal is over, they are to clean their knives and put them back in their places.

The "Young Children's Book" has similar instructions:

"Keep thy knife both clean and sharp,"  
 "And be not busy for to carp," (kerpe—to chatter)  
 "Cleanse thy knife with some cut bread,"  
 "Not with thy cloth as I thee rede." (advise)

Wynkyn de Worde tells the Carver that his knife must be fair, and his hands clean, and that in carving fish, flesh, fowl or bread he must be careful to put only two fingers and a thumb on his knife. He also adds that the carver must carve carefully, especially for ladies, as they soon get angry, "for their thoughts be soon changed, and some lords will be soon pleased and some will not, as they be of complexion;" which seems a very reasonable criticism from one who had doubtless had a good deal of experience, of the humours of women and the tempers of men.

There were no salt-spoons, even when the latest of these books, "Seager's School of Virtue," was written. So to take salt with your knife was the proper thing to do, and certainly it was better than dipping the meat into the salt-cellar, as those who were wanting in "good courtesy" used to do.

In some of the earlier books, "The Babees" and the "Young



Children's," the use of the knife as a salt-spoon is not mentioned, but the children are warned in both, "not to dip their meat in the salt-cellar, but to lay the salt honestly on their trenchers."

In "Stans Puer ad Mensam" the knife is recommended:

"And wheresoe'er thou be to dine or sup,"

"Of gentleness take salt with thy knife;"

"And be well ware thou blow not in thy cup,"

"Reverence thy fellows; begin with them no strife."<sup>17</sup>

Hugh Rhodes mentions both customs:

"Dip not thy meat in the salt-cellar,"

"But take it with thy knife."

"The Book of Courtesy" (Sloane MS.) alludes to dipping food in the salt-cellar as a vice; and Seager counsels his readers to reach and take salt with the knife.

The use of the knife as a tooth-pick is frequently inveighed against; it is first mentioned in the "Young Children's Book," and Hugh Rhodes has a very quaint suggestion to offer as a substitute.

"Pick not thy teeth with thy knife,"

"Nor with thy fingers' end;"

"But take a stick or some clean thing,"

"Then you do not offend."<sup>18</sup>

The "Book of Courtesy" forbids picking the teeth at all at table, whether with knife or straw or stick.

Forks were not introduced till later, and are not mentioned in any of these books; spoons were used, and various hints are given as to their management:

"And when thou hast thy pottage done,"

"Out of the dish thou put thy spoon."<sup>19</sup>

and again:

"In thy dish set not thy spoon,"

"Nor on the brink, as unlearned done."

is the advice of the author of "The Young Children's Book."

It was the approved fashion to wipe the spoon at table; this is recommended in "Stans Puer ad Mensam," and in Rhodes's "Book of Nurture," where the owner is cautioned to take care it is not stolen; from which we gather each person had but one spoon and had it in his own keeping. The "Book of Courtesy" quaintly says:

"Lay not thy spoon on thy dish side,"

"But cleanse it honestly without pride."<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Stans Puer ad Mensam, 64-68.

<sup>18</sup> Book of Nurture, 246-250.

<sup>19</sup> Young Children's Book, 41-45.

<sup>20</sup> The Book of Courtesy, 73-74.

Handkerchiefs were not in general use in the 15th century, but by Hugh Rhodes's time they had come into fashion, as he mentions them. The management of the nose is a topic dealt with very plainly, and also exhaustively in all these books, and evidently the advice given was very necessary.

It is rather singular to find that to cut your bread instead of breaking it is considered better manners by all these authorities on courtesy; thus we find the "Babees" told to "cut with your knife your bread and break it not," the "Young Children" are ordered not to break their bread, and not to put pieces into their pockets, thus the mediaeval version of "eat all you like, and pocket none," is

"The morsels that thou beginnest to touch,"

"Cast them not in thy pouch."

People apparently sometimes shared the same dish and ate out of it together, as late as Rhodes wrote, for he says:

"If any man eat of your dish, crumb you therein no bread."

He also advises the bread be cut into little bits to put in the soup or broth: "Of bread, slice out fair morsels to put into your potage."

The Sloane "Book of Courtesy" directs minutely how the bread, evidently a dinner roll, was to be cut:

"Pare thy bread, and carve in two,"

"The upper crust the nether fro',"

"In four thou cut the other dole,"

"Set them together as it were whole."

"Then cut the nether crust in three,"

"And turn it down, learn this from me."

A few lines further on it is directed that bread be broken, not bitten, and the remains given to the poor:

"Bite not thy bread and lay it down,"

"That is no courtesy to use in town,"

"But break as much as thou wilt eat,"

"The remnant to the poor thou shalt let."<sup>21</sup>

The reader is also warned in this book not to sop his bread in his "dish," and after biting it, dip it in again:

"Thou art unkind if thou do so."

This giving of some of the food from the tables of the rich to the poor was a regular custom and a religious duty; in large households there was an officer called the "almoner," whose duty it was to bring in the alms-dish and keep the broken food and wine that was left, and he was sworn to give it all to the poor. The first loaf was put into this dish by the carver, and a piece of

<sup>21</sup> Book of Courtesy, Sloane MS. 35, 41-50.

everything the lord was served with, except any tit-bit that the lord sent to any stranger.

After the washing of hands the almoner said grace and set down the alms-dish:

"Therein the Carver a loaf shall set,"

"To serve God first without let." (hindrance)

"The other loaves he pares about,"

"Lays it in the dish without doubt;"

"The almoner a rod shall have in hand,"

"As for alms-office, I understand."

"All the broken meat he keeps, I wate," (know)

"To deal to poor men at the gate;"

"And drink that is left served in hall,"

"Of rich and poor, both great and small."

"He is sworn to oversee the service well,"

"And deal it to the poor."<sup>22</sup>

In Bishop Grossetest's "Household Statutes," it is laid down that these alms are to be given to the poor and sick, not to the servants for their table. The date of the MS. is about 1450, the directions are worth quoting for the sake of their delightful frankness.

"Command ye that your alms be kept, and not sent to boys and knaves, neither in the hall nor out of the hall, nor be wasted in suppers nor dinners of grooms, but wisely, temperately, without bate or betyng (abating or eating) be it distributed and then parted to poor men, beggars, sick folk and feeble."

The balance between the relative values of speech and silence is very evenly held in these old books especially by Seager, whose judgment in this matter we must quote:

"Let not thy tongue at the table walk,"

"And of no matter neither reason nor talk;"

"Temper thy tongue and stomach alway,"

"For 'measure is treasure,' the proverb doth say."

\* \* \*

"For silence keeping, thou shalt not be shent,"

"Whereas thy speech may cause thee repent."

"Both speech and silence are commendable,"

"But silence is metest in a child at the table."

\* \* \*

"And Cato doth say that 'in old and young,"

"the first of virtues is to keep thy tongue.'"<sup>23</sup>

The "Babees" are admonished not to chatter, and when their

<sup>22</sup> Book of Courtesy, 730-744.

<sup>23</sup> School of Virtue, 472-492.



lord is drinking, to observe "right stable silence without loud loud laughter, or jangling; whispering, joking or any other insolence."

The Book of Courtesy (Sloane MS.), while urging moderation in speech, truthfulness and prudence, and forbidding arguing with the lord or whispering, tells the reader to answer cheerily when greeted, and not to be dumb, lest people say, "he has no mouth."

"Go not forth as a dumb freke," (fellow)

"Since God has left thee tongue to speak."

The author of "The Young Children's Book" makes a very wise and true remark, on the evil of much speaking, as dangerous a habit in those days as now.

"Look thou laugh not nor grin,"

"And with much speech thou may'st do sin."

and again:

"Of whom thou speakest, where and when,"

"Advise the well, and to what men."

"Advise thee well, and to what men."

easy to do, and sums up too much talking very succinctly and perhaps very truly also:

"Babble not o'er much, my friend,"

"If thou wilt be called wise,"

"To speak or prate, or use much talk,"

"Engenders many lies."

The counsels to servants in his "Book of Nurture," especially in the matter of speech, are very shrewd, as for example:

"Be not checkmate with thy master,"

"For one word give not four;"

"Such a servant continueth too long,"

"If he pass but an hour."

and apparently would have received prompt notice to quit if Mr. Rhodes had been his master.

"Few words in a servant wise,"

"Deserveth commendation;"

"Such servants as be of much speech"

"Are ill of operation."

Yet Mr. Rhodes did not approve of changing servants often:

"A hasty or wilful master,"

"That oft changeth servant;"

"And a servant of fleeting,"

"Lack wit and wisdom, I warrant."

He would have a servant put up with his master's temper:

"For a servant to suffer in anger,"

"To his master is a treasure,"

and dress according to his degree, and avoid looking at himself and his clothes:

"Behold not thyself in thy apparel,"

"In church nor in the street."

"To gaze on thyself men will think,"

"It is a thing unmeet."

We have not space to quote further from Rhodes's instructions for the "Waiting Servant," which are very diffuse, and can only not be called prosy because they are written in verse.

Bishop Grossetest ordered that all the servants were to be made to sit together in the hall, not three or four in one place and the rest at another table, and no private meals were to be allowed them, "for of such cometh great destruction, and no worship thereby groweth to the lord."

On the whole enough has been quoted, though the worst customs have been omitted, to show that although as said above in many ways the manners, especially at table, of the Middle Ages, strike us as disgusting, yet our want of courtesy to elders and superiors would shock our ancestors equally. Courtesy with them was a religious duty, moreover they realized what we have long since forgotten, that:

"Courtesy came from heaven,"

"When Gabriel our Lady greet,"

"And Elizabeth with her met,"

"All virtues be enclosed in courtesy."<sup>24</sup>

So while we reserve to ourselves the right of thinking we have vastly improved in some ways since Rhodes and Russell wrote, in other ways we are willing to stand aside and let the Middle Ages pass before us,

"For that is Courtesy."

---

<sup>24</sup> Young Children's Book, 6-9.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR MOST HOLY FATHER,  
POPE PIUS X.TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN THE CARDINALS, ARCHBISHOPS,  
AND BISHOPS OF FRANCE AND TO THE FRENCH CLERGY AND PEOPLE,

PIUS X., POPE.

*Venerable Brethren and Beloved Sons, Health and Apostolic Benediction.*

ONCE again the serious events which have been precipitated in your noble country compel Us to write to the Church of France to sustain her in her trials, and to comfort her in her sorrow. When the children are suffering the heart of the Father ought more than ever to go out to them. And so, now that We see you suffer, from the depths of our fatherly heart floods of tenderness break forth more copiously than ever, and flow to you with the greater comfort and sweetness.

These sufferings, Venerable Brethren and beloved sons, now find a sorrowful echo throughout the whole Catholic Church; but We feel them more deeply still and We sympathize with a pity which grows with your trials and seems to increase day by day.

But with these cruel sorrows the Master has, it is true, mingled a consolation than which none can be dearer to our heart. It springs from your unshakable attachment to the Church, from your unflinching fidelity to this Apostolic See, and from the firm and deeply founded unity that reigns amongst you. On this fidelity and union We confidently reckoned from the first, for We were too well aware of the nobleness and generosity of the French heart to have any fear that on the field of battle disunion would find its way into your ranks. Equally great is the joy that We feel at the magnificent spectacle you are now giving to the world; and with our high praise of you before the whole Church, We give thanks from the depths of Our heart the Father of mercies, the Author of all good.

Recourse to God, so infinitely good, is all the more necessary because, far from abating, the struggle grows fiercer and expands unceasingly. It is no longer only the Christian faith that they would uproot at all costs from the hearts of the people; it is any belief which lifting man above the horizon of this world would supernaturally bring back his wearied eyes to heaven. Illusion on the subject is no longer possible. War has been declared against everything



supernatural, because behind the supernatural stands God, and because it is God that they want to tear out of the mind and heart of man.

The war will be bitter and without respite on the part of those who wage it. That as it goes on harder trials than those which you have hitherto known await you is possible and even probable. Common prudence calls on each of you to prepare for them. And this you will do simply, valiantly, and full of confidence, sure that however fiercely the fight may rage, victory will in the end remain in your hands.

The pledge of this victory is your union first of all amongst yourselves, and secondly with this Apostolic See. This twofold union will make you invincible, and against it all efforts will break.

Our enemies have on this been under no misapprehensions. From the outset, and with the greatest clearness of vision, they determined on their objective; first to separate you from Us and the Chair of Peter, and then to sow disorder among you. From then till now they have made no change in their tactics; they have pursued their end without rest and by every means; some with comprehensive and catching formulas; others with the most brutal cynicism. Specious promises, dishonorable bribes offered to schism, threats and violence, all these have been brought into play and employed. But your clear-sighted fidelity has wrecked all these attempts. Thereupon, thinking that the best way to separate you from Us was to shatter your confidence in the Apostolic See, they have not hesitated, from the tribune and in the press, to throw discredit upon Our acts by misrepresenting and sometimes even by calumniating Our intentions.

The Church, they said, is seeking to arouse religious war in France, and is summoning to her aid the violent persecution which has been the object of her prayers. What a strange accusation! Founded by Him who came to bring peace to the world and to reconcile man with God, a Messenger of peace upon earth, the Church could only seek religious war by repudiating her high mission and belying it before the eyes of all. To this mission of patient sweetness and love she rests and will remain always faithful. Besides, the whole world now knows that if peace of conscience is broken in France, that is not the work of the Church but of her enemies. Fair-minded men, even though not of our faith, recognize that if there is a struggle on the question of religion in your beloved country, it is not because the Church was the first to unfurl the flag, but because war was declared against her. During the last twenty-five years she has had to undergo this warfare. That is

the truth and the proof of it is seen in the declarations made and repeated over and over again in the Press, at meetings, at Masonic congresses, and even in Parliament, as well as in the attacks which have been progressively and systematically directed against her. These facts are undeniable, and no argument can ever make away with them. The Church then does not wish for war, and religious war least of all. To affirm the contrary is an outrageous calumny.

Nor has she any desire for violent persecution. She knows what persecution is, for she has suffered it in all times and in all places. Centuries passed in bloodshed give her the right to say with a holy boldness that she does not fear it, and that as often as may be necessary she will be able to meet it. But persecution is in itself an evil, for it is injustice and prevents man from worshipping God in freedom. The Church then cannot desire it, even with a view to the good which Providence in its infinite wisdom ever draws out of it. Besides, persecution is not only evil, it is also suffering, and there we have a fresh reason why the Church, who is the best of mothers, will never seek it.

This persecution which she is reproached as having provoked, and which they declare they have refused, is now being actually inflicted upon her. Have they not within these last days evicted from their houses even the Bishops who are most venerable by their age and virtues, driven the seminarists from the grands and petits séminaires, and entered upon the expulsion of the cures from their presbyteries? The whole Catholic world has watched this spectacle with sadness, and has not hesitated to give the name which they deserved to such acts of violence.

As for the ecclesiastical property which we are accused of having abandoned, it is important to remark that this property was partly the patrimony of the poor and the patrimony, more sacred still, of the dead. It was not permissible to the Church to abandon or surrender it; she could only let it be taken from her by violence. Nobody will believe that she has deliberately abandoned, except under the pressure of the most overwhelming motives, what was confided to her keeping, and what was so necessary for the exercise of worship, for the maintenance of sacred edifices, for the instruction of her clergy, and for the support of her ministers. It was only when perfidiously placed in the position of having to choose between material ruin and consent to the violation of her constitution, which is of divine origin, that the Church refused, at the cost of poverty, to allow the work of God to be touched by her. Her property, then, has been wrested from her; it was not she that abandoned it. Consequently, to declare ecclesiastical property unclaimed on a given

date unless the Church had by then created within herself a new organism; to subject this creation to conditions in rank opposition to the divine constitution of the Church, which was thus compelled to reject them; to transfer this property to third parties as if it had become *sans maitre*, and finally to assert that in thus acting there was no spoliation of the Church but only a disposal of the property abandoned by her—this is not merely argument of transparent sophistry but adding insult to the most cruel spoliation. This spoliation is undeniable in spite of vain attempts at palliating it by declaring that no moral person existed to whom the property might be handed over; for the state has power to confer civil personality on whomsoever the public good demands that it should be granted to, establishments that are Catholic as well as others. In any case it would have been easy for the state not to have subjected the formation of associations cultuelles to conditions in direct opposition to the divine constitution of the Church which they were supposed to serve.

And yet that is precisely what was done in the matter of the associations cultuelles. They were organized under the law in such a way that its dispositions on this subject ran directly counter to those rights which, derived from her constitution, are essential to the Church, notably as affecting the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the inviolable base given to His work by the Divine Master himself. Moreover, the law conferred on these associations powers which are the exclusive prerogative of ecclesiastical authority both in the matter of the exercise of worship and of the proprietorship and administration of property. And lastly, not only are these associations with drawn from ecclesiastical jurisdiction but they are made judicially answerable to the civil authority. These are the reasons which have driven Us in Our previous Encyclicals to condemn these associations cultuelles in spite of the heavy sacrifices which such condemnation involved.

We have also been accused of prejudice and inconsistency. It has been said that We had refused to approve in France what We had approved in Germany. But this charge is equally lacking in foundation and justice. For although the German law was blameable on many points, and has been merely tolerated in order to avoid greater evils, the cases were quite different, for that law contained an express recognition of the Catholic hierarchy, which the French law does not do.

As regards the annual declaration demanded for the exercise of worship, it did not offer the full legal security which one had a right to desire. Nevertheless—though in principle gatherings of the faith-



ful in church have none of the constituent elements proper to public meetings, and it would, in fact, be odious to attempt to assimilate them—the Church could, in order to avoid greater evils, have brought herself to tolerate this declaration. But by providing that the “cure or officiating priest would no longer,” in his church, “be anything more than an occupier without any judicial title or power to perform any acts of administration,” there has been imposed on ministers of religion in the very exercise of their ministry a situation so humiliating and vague that, under such conditions, it was impossible to accept the declaration.

There remains for consideration the law recently voted by the two Chambers.

From the point of view of ecclesiastical property, this law is a law of spoliation and confiscation, and it has completed the stripping of the Church. Although her Divine Founder was born poor in a manger, and died poor on the Cross, although she herself has known poverty from her cradle, the property that came to her was none the less hers, and no one had the right to deprive her of it. Her ownership, indisputable from every point of view, had been, moreover, officially sanctioned by the state, which could not consequently violate it. From the point of view of the exercise of worship, this law has organized anarchy; it is the consecration of uncertainty and caprice. Uncertainty whether places of worship, always liable to be diverted from their purpose, are meanwhile to be placed, or not placed, at the disposition of the clergy and faithful; uncertainty whether they shall be reserved from them or not, and for how long; whilst an arbitrary administrative regulates the conditions of their use, which is rendered eminently precarious. Public worship will be in as many diverse situations as there are parishes in France; in each parish the priest will be at the discretion of the municipal authority. And thus an opening for conflict has been organized from one end of the country to the other. On the other hand, there is an obligation to meet all sorts of heavy charges, whilst at the same time there are draconian restrictions upon the resources by which they are to be met. Thus, though but of yesterday, this law has already evoked manifold and severe criticisms from men belonging indiscriminately to all political parties and all shades of religious belief. These criticisms alone are sufficient judgment of the law.

It is easy to see, Venerable Brethren and beloved sons, from what We have just recalled to you, that this law is an aggravation of the Law of Separation, and we can not therefore do otherwise than condemn it.

The vague and ambiguous wording of some of its articles places

the end pursued by our enemies in a new light. Their object is, as we have already pointed out, the destruction of the Church and the dechristianization of France, but without people's attending to it or even noticing it. If their enterprise had been really popular, as they would not have hesitated to pursue it with visor raised, and to take the whole responsibility, they try to clear themselves of it and deny it, and in order to succeed the better, fling it upon the Church their victim. This is the most striking of all the proofs that their evil work does not respond to the wishes of the country.

It is in vain that after driving Us to the cruel necessity of rejecting the laws that have been made—seeing the evils they have drawn down upon the country, and feeling the universal reprobation which, like a slow tide, is rising round them—they seek to lead public opinion astray and to make the responsibility for these evils fall upon Us. Their attempt will not succeed.

As for Ourselves, We have accomplished Our duty, as every other Roman Pontiff would have done. The high charge with which it has pleased Heaven to invest Us, in spite of Our unworthiness, as also the Christian faith itself, which you profess with Us, dictated to Us Our conduct. We could not have acted otherwise without trampling under foot Our conscience, without being false to the oath which We took on mounting the chair of Peter, and without violating the Catholic hierarchy, the foundation given to the Church by our Savior Jesus Christ. We await, then, without fear, the verdict of history. History will tell how We, with Our eyes fixed immutably upon the defence of the higher rights of God, have neither wished to humiliate the civil power, nor to combat a form of government, but to safeguard the inviolable work of Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ. It will say that We have defended you, Our beloved sons, with all the strength of Our great love; that what We have demanded and now demand for the Church, of which the French Church is the elder daughter and an integral part, is respect for its hierarchy and inviolability of its property and liberty; that if Our demand had been granted religious peace would not have been troubled in France, and that, the day it is listened to that peace so much desired will be restored in the country.

And, lastly, history will say that if, sure beforehand of your magnanimous generosity. We have not hesitated to tell you that the hour for sacrifice had struck, it is to remind the world, in the name of the Master of all things, that men here below should feed their minds upon thoughts of a higher sort than those of the perishable contingencies of this life, and that the supreme and intangible joy of the human soul on earth is that of duty supernaturally carried

out, cost what it may and so God honored, served and loved, in spite of all.

Confident that the Immaculate Virgin, Daughter of the Father, Mother of the Word, and Spouse of the Holy Ghost, will obtain for you from the most holy and adorable Trinity better days, and as a token of the calm which We firmly hope will follow the storm, it is from the depths of Our heart that We impart Our Apostolic Blessing to you, Venerable Brethren, as well as to your clergy and the whole French people.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's on the Feast of the Epiphany, January 6, 1907, the fourth year of Our pontificate. ,

PIUS X., POPE.



## THE CHURCH IN ABYSSINIA.

EARLY in the year 1905 the attention of the Catholic world was drawn to the heroism of two mendicant friars, two French Capuchin missionaries who in the seventeenth century suffered martyrdom in Abyssinia in defence of the Catholic Faith against heresy—Father Agathange of Vendome and Father Cassien of Nantes, whom the Living Voice of the Church, speaking in the person of the Sovereign Pontiff, Pius X, has solemnly beatified.

The story of their lives opens up a page of the early history of the Capuchin Order, when that austere reform of the observance of the Franciscan Rule was in high repute in France, when the Capuchins were in their first fervour, drawing all hearts towards them and leavening French society, high and low, with their own spirituality, counting among them cloistered ascetics and great missionary preachers. The Bourbons were still firmly seated on the throne and the descendants and successors of St. Louis had no apprehension of the great revolutionary cataclysm which about a couple of centuries later was to overthrow throne and altar and involve Church and State in one red ruin.

Francois Noury, to be known hereafter in the annals of hagiography as the Blessed Agathange of Vendome, was the son of Francois Noury and Marguerite Begon and was born at Vendome on July 13, 1598. His father belonged to the magistracy or *elite* of Vendome, occupied an important official as well as social position and was related to the Beauvillier family of Blois which produced counts and dukes of Saint-Aignan. Marie de Beauvillier, daughter of Claude de Beauvillier, Count of Saint Aignan, was abbess and reformer of the Benedictine Abbey of Montmartre at Paris, where from 1598 to 1656 she admitted to profession 227 religious, forty of whom were called to direct other nunneries. Of her Henry IV said his conscience had no misgivings when he recommended as superioress a nun formed by Mdme de Beauvillier. Cardinal de Saurdis sent her as spiritual director and counsellor an eminent Capuchin, Father Benedict of Canfeld who was subsequently imprisoned for three years in England in the penal times and was succeeded in his charge at Montmartre by another distinguished Capuchin, Father Ange de Joyeuse. The Beauvilliers were very devout to St. Francis and very generous to the Franciscans. Honorat de Beauvillier, Count of Saint Aignan, married Jacqueline de la Grange de Montigny, daughter of Marshal de Montigny, governor of Berry and built at his own expense in 1616 the Capuchin convent at Saint Aignan. His

wife, full of confidence in the holiness of Father Benedict of Canfeld, earnestly commended herself to his prayers in order to obtain a son. The friar made her promise, if her prayer was answered, to give the child the name of Francis and clothe him in the Franciscan habit. He then foretold that she would have a son who himself would become the father of a son whose glory would surpass that of all his family. Nine months afterwards she gave birth to Francois de Beauvillier who wore the Capuchin habit until he was seven. He entered the army, distinguished himself by a bravery worthy of his birth, was made Governor of Louisiana, of the city and castle of Loches and Havre de Grace, cultivated literature successfully and became an Academican and in 1667 took the Caen prize for a Franciscan thesis on the Immaculate Conception. He was beloved and esteemed by Louis XIV, was a prominent figure in the Court of the Grand Monarque, and died in 1687, leaving a son, Paul de Beauvillier, Duke of Saint Aignan, a man of austere virtue who likewise gained the affection and esteem of the King who confided to him the education of the Dauphin, Duke of Burgundy, and then the Duke or Anjou (Philip V) and the Duke of Berry. It was he who made choice of Fenelon and formed an intimate friendship with the great Bishop of Cambria which nothing could alter. He became Minister of State and acquired considerable influence at court through the king's affection for him and the authority he exercised over the Dauphin. Profoundly Christian, he never allowed himself to be dazzled by the deceptive brilliancy of human dignities, and always fulfilled his duties with scrupulous exactitude. He died in 1714.

The Capuchins were established in France for a quarter of a century and already possessed numerous convents, the cities and towns vying to procure those austere and charitable friars who were among the most powerful adversaries of Protestantism, which then threatened the tranquility and prosperity of the kingdom. In compliance with a petition from the leading inhabitants of Vendome, who procured a suitable site, a church and convent, begun in 1606 and finished in 1611, were built in that town where Francois Noury, father of the Blessed Agathange, was syndic or temporal father to the community, the man of business of the convent, so to speak; a Franciscan lay office usually filled by a member of one of the best families, in order to leave the religious more time to devote themselves to prayer, study and the work of the ministry. It was one of those links in the providential chain of events which has identified him and his family with the Order, culminating in the recent beatification; and it was in the fitness

of things that he should have taken the most active part in the foundation of the Capuchin friary at Vendome.

Young Francois Noury was eight when Father Raphael of Orleans took possession of the site, and thirteen when the community was definitely formed. Brought up in an exemplary Catholic home, he was deeply impressed by the enthusiastic reception given to the Capuchins by the inhabitants of Vendome and at the sight of men and women of every age and condition laboring with their hands at the building of the convent. A few years previously, in 1601, the city of Tours had offered a still more moving spectacle of the same kind. He must have heard of the vow of his noble relative and seen the young Francois de Beauvillier clad in the Capuchin habit. He frequently visited the convent along with his father and was gradually attracted to the life he saw led within. He was hardly twenty when he entered the novitiate at Le Nans and received from Father Giles of Monnay the Capuchin habit and the religious name of Brother Agathange. After his profession, he was sent to the convent at Poitiers to continue his studies under the direction of Father Ignatius of Nevers, then assisted by the celebrated Father Joseph du Tremblay, and three years subsequently to Rennes for his philosophy and theology. Nothing specially marked him out from his fellow students, except great generosity in the fulfilment of duty and a love of silence, sometimes called taciturnity; charity alone inducing him to quit his converse with God to converse with men. It was in these dispositions he prepared to receive the priesthood to which he was called by obedience just when he was finishing his studies in 1625. His ardent desire to be employed in the missions was gratified by Father Joseph who secured him for the mission of Poitou, then under his direction. When he delivered the Lenten sermons at Vendome in 1626 he made a deep impression on his fellow citizens and acquired a reputation for learning and eloquence which was not effaced a century later, when the Abbe Simon introduced him into his *History* among the distinguished personages of Vendome.

Father Joseph du Tremblay who, by order of Louis XIII and his Minister, Cardinal de Richelieu, had founded the mission of the Levant, with the double object of promoting the growth of Catholicism and ensuring French preponderance in the East, and having been nominated by the Pope Prefect Apostolic, was seeking in all the Provinces of France for religious suitable for this ministry. One of those selected having been stopped from going by a serious malady, Father Francis of Treguier at once called upon Father Agathange to take his place. "Give me two hours



to think it over," said the latter, who went and passed the time in prayer before the altar. Then, rising, he took his breviary and travelling staff and returned to the superior. "Here I am," said he, "send me wherever you like"; and, having knelt and received his blessing and advice, rose at once and set out.

He went, with a companion, as the disciples were sent by the Saviour or the first Franciscans were sent by the Seraphic Father, on foot, braving all weathers and all difficulties, begging their daily bread or a night's lodging. Knocking at the door of a monastery or some Catholic house at sundown after they had wearily wended their way some distance and asking in the name and for the love of God for the hospitality which was rarely refused. The next morning, after saying Mass for them, they thanked their hosts, and, leaving behind them their blessing in exchange for their generosity, they resumed their journey. Thus they traversed the whole of France from Rennes to Marseilles. Those were happy times for French religious, whatever the faults, follies and short-comings of the *ancien regime* may have been from a moral or economic point of view, when they could thus travel leisurely and unmolested under the blue sky and bright sun by day or when the tender tints of twilight softened the light upon the horizon; courteously and charitably treated by the people. They stopped a few days in Paris to receive from Father Joseph the needful obedience and instructions for their mission. At Marseilles they found a vessel about to set sail for Syria, and, after a good passage, they landed at Alexandretta, from whence they proceeded to Aleppo to which their obedience assigned them, and where the Capuchins had a house founded and maintained by the liberality of Louis XIII. Aleppo was then, as now, a considerable city and its population extremely mixed, the numerous native Christians belonging to every denomination—Latin Catholics, Greeks, Maronites and Syrians, Schismatic Greeks and Armenians, Nestorian heretics or Jacobites mingling with the Mussulmans. The Christians were allowed freedom of worship and self-government on condition that they did not try to convert the Mussulmans, which was forbidden under the death penalty. Father Agathange varied the study of Arabic with an active apostolate among Europeans and natives, getting a large number to return to the truth and the practice of virtue by his exhortations. A Greek Schismatic bishop abjured his errors and became a fervent apostle and powerfully seconded the zeal of the European missionaries. The Mussulmans themselves listened attentively to his exposition of the Gospel and some asked to pass into Europe in order to embrace Christianity. The Turkish

Pasha was favorable to this movement and gave all the protection in his powers to the missionaries' preaching.

Toward the close of 1629, being able to address the people in Arabic, he was invited by the Maronites to preach in their church. "They were," they said, "like children asking for bread and no one to break it to them." But the Vicar-General of the Patriarch of the Maronites would not, despite their entreaties, permit him to preach in the churches dependant on his authority, and Father Agathange was sent to the mission in Egypt. In crossing the mountains of the Lebanon to reach his new post he visited the Maronite Patriarch who received him with great kindness, disapproved of the action of his vicar, and asked him to return to his mission. This was impossible, but he consented to remain some months in the Lebanon, evangelizing the populations. He visited almost all the villages where his preaching produced abundant fruit, his austerity of life making a deep impression on the people, so that in a short time the religious condition of these mountaineers, who long remembered his edifying sojourn among them, was marvellously changed. After eight months he took leave of the Patriarch and his diocese and proceeded to his destination, Cairo, which contained the largest population in Egypt, composed of Arabs, Turks, Moors and the older inhabitants of the country reduced to a kind of serfdom by successive conquests and elbowed at every step by negroes from Central Africa, Jews and Europeans or Franks. All the sects of Islam, every Christian communion being represented in an ethnological conglomerate in the midst of this Babylon, as it had been called in the middle ages. The Catholics, properly so called, were comparatively few, most of the Christians, very numerous and in the enjoyment of religious freedom, having been separated from the church for centuries through adoption of the errors of Eutyches and Dioscorus, to which they added a crowd of practices borrowed from Judaism or the ancient religious traditions of their country. They have several bishops, a large number of priests and monks, and are under the jurisdiction of a self-styled Patriarch of Alexandria. Their priests, married like those of the Greeks, are very illiterate; only the monks and bishops, chosen from among the monks, have preserved the traces of learning. They are proud of the antiquity of their church, which dates from the Apostolic age, and, ignorant of theological and historical truth, hold strongly to their errors and still more to their independence. Attempts at reunion, which occasionally gave some grounds of hope, have been only partly successful.

Father Agathange possessed everything desirable for such an

undertaking, solid learning an intelligent appreciation of the position, striking virtues and austerity of life, which yielded nothing to that of the Coptic monks. Those who preceded him in the Cairo mission had only addressed themselves to individuals; he resolved to go at once straight to the heart of the difficulty and labor to lead back to Catholic unity the Patriarch himself; for he alone is independent and his conversion should determine that of all the others, bishops, priests, monks, and laity. He found the Patriarch, Mattaios, who usually lived in the monastery of St. Macarius, a venerable old man, gentle in speech, of affable manners, extensive information, elevation of mind, piety and uprightness of judgment which inspired the best hopes. He only needed to have been brought up in the Catholic religion to be one of the most remarkable prelates of his time. The Capuchin missionary was received with the greatest kindness and hospitality. After a few days spent in gaining his good graces, he made known the object of his journeys. His overtures met with a favorable reception, and conferences on the controverted point at once began. Several weeks were passed in discussions in which the spirit of charity always prevailed. The Patriarch, who showed the greatest good faith, finally declared himself convinced and recognized the truth of Catholic doctrines. There only remained the question of the reunion of the church. The Patriarch held out the greatest hopes, he even gave assurance of his intention of effecting it solemnly and soon. He had to go to Cairo for his visitation and he would avail of that occasion to assemble a council, exhort his suffragans and all his subjects and put a final seal upon this great work. He got Father Agathange to write to Rome to have everything ready. The Prefect of the congregation of Propaganda replied in a most fraternal and affectionate letter to the Patriarch, encouraging him to overcome the last irresolutions which still withheld him far from unity. The Patriarch then wrote to Pope Urban VIII, manifesting the greatest desire for union. Unhappily Mattaios was old; his great age prevented him from going to Cairo and assembling his council; his irresolution returned, perhaps also the regret of renouncing the Primacy still restrained him; and he died a few years afterwards without abjuring his error, at least publicly.

Returning to Cairo with a letter of recommendation from the Patriarch in which he enjoined all his priests to receive the Latin missionary in their churches, allow him to celebrate Mass according to the Roman Rite, catechise the people and disseminate Catholic doctrine, and the faithful were exhorted to hear him as a minister of Jesus Christ whose teaching was true, morals



edifying and faith free from error, he immediately put himself in relations with the Coptic priests who served the fourteen churches in the city, and who promised to help him in the fulfilment of his mission. Numerous conversions rewarded his zeal and a general movement towards the Catholic Church became more marked every day and filled the hearts of Father Agathange and his companions with joy.

Realizing that it is from the monasteries the religious initiative should come, he returned to his primitive project, the conversion of the monks. Built by Saints contemporaries of St. Anthony, St. Macarius and St. Athanasius, the monasteries still contain a large number of religious, following the same rule as of yore. Successors of the saintly Ascetics of the Thebaid, these monks have preserved a great number of antique traditions and their manner of life is a distant reflection of the austerities of the early anchorites. Despite the ravages of time and the successive invasions which have devastated Egypt, some remnants exist therein of the libraries founded in every monastery by order of St. Athanasius and increased by his successors, so jealously guarded that modern travellers find great difficulty in getting to see them and taking an inventory of the literary treasures they contain. The monks, more careful perhaps, to preserve their books than to study them, are generally uncultured, but nevertheless some are found above the ordinary level. Besides they are very superior to the secular clergy and their learning, such as it is, adds a lustre to their piety which gives them great influence. It is from their ranks the Patriarch and bishops are always chosen, for celibacy, which is not obligatory upon secular priests, is for bishops among the Copts as well as the Greeks. The esteem they are held in, the conviction of their influence and learning, far inferior, however, to that of the Latin clergy renders them self-opinionated and difficult to lead into Catholicism. The monasteries are still very numerous, and there were three large communities. They recognize no superior distinct from the Patriarch, but they are united by the bonds of charity, mutually helpful, and the monks can readily exchange from one to the other. Father Agathange went to the monastery of St. Anthony, one of the most celebrated in Egypt, but after successive conferences only one could make up his mind to return to Catholicism and abjure his errors. Recalled to Cairo by the needs of his mission, new converts were added to the precious ones who were confirmed, while the multitude promised to submit to the Roman Church as soon as the Patriarchs set them the example of submission. Meanwhile reflection, aided by grace,

had its effect on the hearts of the monks, the good seed he had sown had fructified, and they all expressed a wish to see him again. Upon his return he received the abjuration of a certain number who became apostles in turn and zealously strove to Catholicise the entire community.

Father Agathange's attention was diverted from these controversies by the arrival of a Syrian Catholic bishop who came to invite him to accompany him into his diocese. These Christians called Syrians on account of their rite, and Jacobites from their sect, were subject to a Patriarch who, later on, yielding at the instance of the Latin missionaries, made submission to Pope Alexander VII (1660). At the epoch referred to (1634) this submission had not yet taken place, but the prelate was already giving evidence of better dispositions, and was not preventing the bishops and faithful of his obedience from submitting to the authority of Rome. The bishop who had come to see Father Agathange was already a Catholic and had under his jurisdiction a rather numerous Christian flock scattered over all lower Egypt. They visited the Syrian Christians together and paid a short visit to the monastery of St. Macarius. On his return to Cairo he found Father Cassien of Nantes, who was to be the companion of his labours and to share in his martyrdom.

Father Cassien, who was born at Nantes on January 15, 1607, belonged to a family of Portuguese origin. Lopez Netts, his father, was very much attached to his native country, and his mother, Guyonne d'Almeiras, was also a Portuguese. It is said that on their arrival at Nantes, after their marriage, a beggar, who got mixed up among the crowd of relatives and friends who went to welcome them, exclaimed, "See the bride! She will have three boys, one of whom will be crowned." The family consisted of three boys and three girls. The eldest son was a doctor, who exercised that noble profession in a spirit of charity on a par with his scientific attainments, and died at Saint Bruens in great reputation of sanctity, having edified the whole town by the practice of every Christian virtue. One of the girls, Beatrix, twin sister of Father Cassien, refused the most advantageous offers of marriage in order to serve God with more freedom of mind and without entering religion, led a celibate life in the world. The youngest of the sons was the only one who was married, to perpetuate the name and family of Lopez-Nelto in Nantes. Father Cassien, the second son, received in baptism the name of Consallo, and when very young was confided to the care of pious priests who then directed the

college of Saint Clement. Even in his youth he began to practice mortification and to cultivate a spirit of prayer, rising very early in the morning to spend an hour meditating on the Passion. The Capuchin convent being very near his father's house, he made acquaintance with the friars who liked to talk with him and looked upon as an angel. They related to him the life of St. Francis, taught him the methods of mental prayer, and were astonished as well as edified by the ripe wisdom of his observations. Moved by a desire to communicate the faith to infidel peoples, he was already wishful at nine of being admitted into the Order. The missions of the Levant had been founded and the home missions, organized to bring back to Catholicism the provinces which Protestantism had invaded were attended with the happiest results. The Capuchins engaged warmly in both. The son of Loppez-Nelto doubtless heard the friars often talk of them and, listening eagerly, believed himself called by God to join in this work. He asked Father Giles of Mounay, then guardian of the Nantes convent, to admit him into the noviciate in order to prepare to convert heretics and infidels, but the latter smilingly replied, "You are yet too young: then to convert heretics and pagans needs learning and piety. Strive to become a learned man and a saint and, in a few years, when the rules of the church will permit, we may make you a novice and a religious, later on a missionary and perhaps, a martyr." He applied himself earnestly and successfully to study and when he was fifteen, and had finished a course of rhetoric, he renewed his request to the Capuchin Superiors who consulted his parents. At his father's suggestion his entrance was deferred for two years and, that period of probation having elapsed, he repaired to Angers where the noviciate of the province of Bretagne and Touraine was situated, and where he received the Capuchin habit and the name of Brother Cassien on February 16, 1623, being admitted to profession the year following.

He studied at Rennes under Father Francis de Treguiet who had taught Father Agathange and formed several other religious who shed their blood or spent their lives in the missions of Syria, Palestine or Egypt. In the year he was ordained, 1631, Rennes was ravaged by the plague. The victims were so numerous and the terror so widespread that it was difficult to get parents to care for their kindred when stricken with the contagion. All the sick were then conveyed to the sanatorium, transformed subsequently into a general hospital. It was given in charge of the Capuchins. Father Cassien was one of those sent to serve the



sick. Although he caught the infection he did not cease to administer the spiritual and temporal succor needed, forgetting himself to think only of others, taking no rest until he was worn out with fatigue. When the last vestiges of the contagion disappeared, he returned to the convent to resume his course of studies which he finished in 1663.

For a long time the foreign missions had been the object of all his most ardent desires and he had earnestly begged his superiors to send him. At length he got his obedience for the Cairo mission from Father Joseph du Tremblay and set out with Father Benedict of Dijon, who had been his companion in the noviciate. After a long voyage from Marseilles, during which a furious tempest threatened to engulf the vessel, and a few weeks sojourn at Alexandria, he arrived at Cairo and at once applied himself to the study of Arabic. Some Portuguese from Abyssinia, on their way to Jerusalem to visit the holy places, passed through Cairo and asked hospitality of the French Capuchins. Father Cassien, who spoke their language perfectly, received them with great cordiality. They expressed a wish to see new missionaries in Abyssinia replace the Jesuits, persecuted and driven out of the country. Father Agathange, then in Cairo, listened to this conversation and, along with Father Cassien, conceived the project of going to sustain the faith in Abyssinia, menaced after the persecution of the Jesuits. They wrote to Father Joseph to obtain the necessary permission from Rome. Meanwhile Father Cassien acquired from the Portuguese pilgrims the elements of the Ethiopian language, and both the Capuchins pursued their missionary work, feeling the sacred thirst of martyrdom deep in their souls with the growing consciousness that Abyssinia was to be the scene of their combats.

Christianity had been primitively introduced into Ethiopia, now known to us as Abyssinia, by the eunuch whom St. Philip baptized; but it does not seem to have made much progress in the beginning. In the fourth century that great Christian apologist and doctor of the Church, St. Athanasius, sent thither a bishop\* and missionaries formed in his school and soon the reign of Christ extended over the vast plains of equatorial Africa. This new and flourishing Church depended on the patriarchal See of Alexandria and shared its destinies. When schism and heresy were seated on the throne which had so long been the bulwark of the faith, the different churches dependent on it became infected with the same moral poison. The errors of Dioscorus and

---

\* Frumentius consecrated by Bishop of Ethiopia by St. Athanasius, A. D. 330.

Eutyches took possession of all minds, distance from the centre of unity and unceasing political revolutions favoring their growth. Old Jewish or pagan traditions still existing were mingled with this degenerate Christianity, without, however, changing the implicit and earnestness of the people's faith. When Islamism overflowed like a torrent and subjected the greater part of the eastern countries, Ethiopia remained free under the authority of kings or emperors called Negus-Nagasti (king of kings) who pretended to be direct descendants of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba; but, isolated from every other portion of Christendom, it was, as it were, shut up in error and has since remained more or less stationary. Only one bishop, called Abun or Abouna, sent by the Schismatical Patriarch of Alexandria, resides there; subject to him are a multitude of priests and monks who follow a rule analogous to that of the Coptic priests and monks already referred to. History records several attempts at reunion with the See of Rome; delegates were sent to several councils; union was even officially proclaimed, but in vain, for soon this feeling evaporated through the malevolence of princes. The zealous ambition of Egyptian heretics and all the causes that had contributed to the planting of schism there. In 1605, the grand Negus Zadinghel, enlightened by some Portuguese travellers, had sent ambassadors to Pope Clement VIII and Philip III of Spain to ask for missionaries capable of instructing his people and bringing them under obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff. Both Pope and King, delighted with this proposition, confided the mission to the Portuguese Jesuits. Numerous conversions quickly followed, the Catholic Hierarchy was established, a Patriarch of Ethiopia was sent from Spain (Spain and Portugal were then united) and the time when all Abyssinia would become Catholic seemed imminent. But Zadinghel, not content with this progress, however rapid it was, wanted to hasten conversions, and actuated more by his own blind zeal than the true spirit of the gospel, which gives no sanction to constraint as a method of apostolate, issued an edict ordering all heretics or schismatics to quit his kingdom if, within a given time, and a short time, they did not embrace Catholicism. The time having elapsed, he put to death a considerable number of obstinate non-conformists. The others revolted against his despotism, took up arms, and the well-meaning but misguided monarch fell in an engagement with the rebels.

Sussries, or Sussinios, his son, succeeded and walked in his footsteps. A still more general rising threatened him with the

loss of life and scepter; but he triumphed over his enemies and established his throne upon a land steeped in blood. During the rest of his reign, willingly or unwillingly, in good faith or through hypocrisy, Catholicism seemed to prevail over the whole country. But Sussries did not live long enough to realize all that he expected from his victory and violence; he died soon after, leaving the throne to his son Basilides, too young yet to govern by himself, but old enough, however, to have seen his father's faults, the troubles he had experienced and the dangers he had run for the cause of religion. His mother, Sussrie's widow, seized the reigns of government. She had never been a Catholic at heart, although she outwardly appeared to be. As soon as her husband was dead she threw off the mask, and, encouraged by Europeans who made her dread the power of Spain, she resolved to destroy Zadinghel's and Sussrie's work. An edict was soon issued which forbade, under the severest penalties, the exercise of the Catholic religion; Catholics at court who remained steadfast in the faith were exiled; the Jesuits were proscribed and forbidden to enter the kingdom; those who remained, despite the prohibition, had to conceal their identity and several fell victims to their zeal. To consummate the schism the King sent to the Patriarch of Alexandria for an Abouna or bishop.

Since the departure of Alfonso-Mendez, Catholic Patriarch of Ethiopia, there was no other bishop in the country but an Egyptian imposter who was neither priest nor cleric and did not even know how to read. He drove the priests ordained by the Jesuits out of the churches and inducted others whom he "consecrated" by breathing on their faces and pretending to read some words in an Arabic book. The King finally discovered the imposter and it was then he sent to the Patriarch Mattaios for a bishop.

Father Agathange was with his friend the Patriarch when the delegates arrived. His heart was painfully moved when he heard in detail of the events of which he had partial knowledge from the Portuguese pilgrims. He was, nevertheless, not discouraged, but even strengthened in his design of going to the succor of the few Jesuits hiding in the country or intrenched in the mountains where some Catholics were defending themselves against the troops of Basilides. But time was needed for the obedience from Rome and the delegates would not tarry any longer. Father Agathange, availing of the good dispositions of Mattaios, already a Catholic at heart, although outwardly a schismatic,



got him to consecrate as arch bishop of Ethiopia, a monk of the Abbey of St. Anthony, won over to Catholicism, and upon whom he thought he could count.

This was Abbot Mark Ariminios. In a letter to the exiled Patriarch Mendez he wrote: "I have often conferred with him on several articles of faith and found by the grace of God that he was persuaded that all the dogmas of religion we profess are true. I cannot, however, venture to assure you that he is a Catholic, which I should greatly desire, but I may say that he is well intentioned towards the Roman Church. He is taking with him a Lutheran of German origin who gives no real ground for alarm. I know his bad designs and he has been a great obstacle to the propagation of the faith here. I hope God will bring his influence to naught, and that all the efforts the devil is making against us will turn to his confusion and our advantage. The Patriarch Mendez was at Souakim when Ariminios and Peter Heyling, the Lutheran referred to, delivered this letter. He had several conversations with them and formed a different opinion of them than Father Agathange. He foresaw that the Abouna, frankly Jacobite and crafty, would be a persecutor of the Catholics, and found Heyling mild and insinuating, but did not think there was much likelihood of the spread of Lutheranism through his instrumentality as the Abyssinians are very much attached to their religion. In the sequel Ariminios was the cause of the failure of Catholicism in Ethiopia and the Lutheran was the instigator of his shameful apostacy. Of Swedish extraction and by profession a doctor, Heyling, better known by the name of Peter Leo, was animated with the deadliest hatred of Catholicism and resolved on its destruction in Abyssinia. To reach his ends he first disguised his Lutheranism under the guise of Catholicism. Father Agathange, who had intimation of his secret designs, did everything to prevent his going to Ethiopia and, along with Father Michael of Saxony, superior of the Dominican mission in Egypt, had him closely watched. He saw in the consecration of Ariminios a favorable opportunity for the executions of his project and, under an assumed name asked the Patriarch Mattaios to receive him into his monastery, affecting a great desire to help in the instruction of his monks and to embrace Catholicism. Admitted to the noviciate, in order to receive the habit of the monks of St. Macarius he submitted to the ceremony of circumcision, and after a short time was professed. Having obtained permission to accompany the newly-appointed bishop and a letter of recommen-

dation to the Negus, he warmed himself into the confidence of Arminios during the voyage and tried to wean him from the true faith. He pretended to be very zealous for the Coptic Church, which he rated above all others, saying that it ought not to be subject to the Roman Pontiffs, that if the Coptic bishops listened to the emissaries of Rome they would soon be overthrown and the long series of the successors of St. Mark, St. Athanasius and other great Patriarchs would be interrupted. The bishop began to conceive a dread of the Roman Church and of union with it. Seeing that the prelate cherished a great affection for Father Agathange and had a great veneration for his virtues, Heyling impressed him with the latter's superiority, and insinuated that, in getting him consecrated bishop, his only object was to introduce himself into Abyssinia to gain, under the shelter of the episcopal throne, the confidence of the King and people, when nothing would remain for Ariminios but the fate of Simeon his predecessor who, vanquished in a public discussion by the Jesuit Paez, was covered with confusion, obliged to leave the kingdom and earn his living as a miller. Who knows, he added, if Father Agathange has not had himself consecrated bishop in place of Alfonso Mendez, driven out of your See and exiled by King Basilides? He so far prevailed over the weak and distrustful character of Ariminios that the latter resolved to keep Agathange at bay. Heyling went farther. He resolved to compass his death. In these dispositions they arrived in January, 1637, at Gondar, one of the capitals of Ethiopia, where they found Basilides with his mother and his whole court. The Negus received the Abouna with great demonstrations of piety and solemnly installed him, and Ariminios presented Heyling who promptly acquired such influence that on account of his knowledge which appeared greater to the ignorant Abyssinians than it really was, he was asked to open a school, which was soon filled with scholars into whose lessons he introduced his Lutheran errors. Meanwhile Ariminios saw that things were hardly favorable to union with Rome; that the resistance to the Jesuits, the civil war which had desolated the country, and the old prejudices revived and strengthened by victory would not admit of a movement in that direction. He threw his lot in with the party which suited his interests and gave himself up completely to schism; he even obtained from the Negus an order to stop at the frontier all foreigners who were trying to penetrate into the country on the pretext that they only wanted to introduce disorder. Heyling now felt assured of the success of his scheme and fancied the day

was near at hand when all Abyssinia would be captured by Lutheranism.

After making a pilgrimage to the holy land, to pray in the very place where our Lord had shed His blood for love of us, for courage to shed theirs for love of Him and obtained letters for Basilides and Ariminios from the Patriarch Mattaios, who suggested, as a measure of safety, wearing the Coptic religious habit over that of the Capuchins, they prepared to proceed to Abyssinia, their obediences having arrived from Rome during their absence in Palestine, Father Benedict of Dijon and Father Agathange of Morlaix being included therein. It was more difficult then, than now, to get to Abyssinia from Cairo. Happily Providence came to their relief. The Sultan of Constantinople exercised a certain authority over the city of Souakin where a Pacha ruled in his name. A new Pacha had just been named and the missionaries, having got permission to accompany him, set out on December 23, 1637, reaching Souakin about the middle of March. From Souakin they made their way to Arkiko, one of the principal ports on the Red Sea, in the escort of a Turkish official, and from thence in a caravan towards Dembea, where the Negus and his court then were, having as a precaution donned the Coptic habit. After eight days march, they arrived at Barba, the capital of one of the Ethiopian provinces, the governor of which had received orders to stop all foreign religious, a priest sent by Ariminios seeing carefully to the execution of this order, furnished with an exact description of the French friars, who were immediately recognized on their arrival. Questioned by the governor, Theodore and the Albounas envoy, the missionaries did not at first say what they were, but simply bearers of letters from the Patriarch Mattaios to the Negus, the bishop, and the Abyssinian people. Theodore ordered their luggage to be searched, whereupon the discovery of portable altars, sacred ornaments and European books caused them to be recognized as priests and missionaries. They thought their letters would ensure their being respected, but even these letters, with everything that belonged to them, were seized; they were stripped of their Coptic habits, loaded with heavy chains and thrown into a dungeon. The governor of the province, Mathias, informed of what was going on, sent for the letters, forwarded them to Gondar and ordered the prisoners to be strictly guarded. His orders were rigorously executed. They were kept for three entire days without food. God, however touched the heart of a good Coptic nun named Monica, sister of the Governor Theodore, who visited the imprisoned



friars, brought them provisions, and cared for them. She was rewarded by being led back to the true faith by their words, was absolved from her heresy, and later on, merited to be miraculously informed of the martyrdom of her benefactors. During the forty days of their captivity they only partook of a half pound of bread and some water every day, wishing by mortification to prepare for martyrdom, for which they daily yearned since their departure for the missions.

At length the Emperor's orders arrived. He commanded the prisoners to be sent to Gondar, well guarded, and treated as state criminals. They were then completely stripped of their habits, bound with thick cords so tightly drawn that they penetrated the flesh, attached to the tails of mules ridden by their guards, whom they were obliged to follow on foot, with no time for rest except what they were forced to give the animals. The journey took nearly a month. At last they reached Gondar on June 3, 1638. Then their religious habits were returned to them, and they were presented to the Emperor, who, without caring to hear them, sentenced them to be hanged. The missionaries, without complaining of this sentence, asked to be allowed to speak to the Abouna. Basilides had a great veneration for this prelate and did nothing without consulting him. He would not proceed further without having his advice. The prisoners were sent away under guard, pending the audience.

Ariminios, fearing to face Father Agathange, who had received his objuration and whom gratitude obliged him to venerate for many reasons, moved in addition by Heyling who dreaded losing his influence, refused this interview. He would have wished to obtain the immediate execution of the death sentence; but the King, who already regretted his first impulse, and who did not know the secret motives of Ariminios' insistence, persisted in his opinion and finally fixed a day for the interview.

The Catholics, still rather numerous, apprised of what was going on, crowded to the prison gates, drawing along with them a multitude of heretics. Father Cassien, who spoke their language, discoursed to them on the blindness of those who were separated from the See of Rome. His style of speaking naturally pleasing, and the Ethiopian language, very sweet sounding in itself, further favored his talent, so that his address made a great impression on the people, but the court, informed of this, had him thrown into a dungeon until the day of audience.

The tribunal at length assembled, the Negus himself presiding, having near him the Abouna, the whole court being present,

as well as a considerable number of people. The friars came forward with courage and boldness, but without vain audacity, and, confiding in the promises of Christ, replied to the questions put to them. The Negus first asked them who they were and why they had come to Abyssinia. Father Cassien replied that they were Catholics, religious of the Order of St. Francis, called Capuchins, that their country was France, that they might have lived there happy and tranquil, but that a divine inspiration urged them to leave their country to carry the light of faith to infidels; that this same inspiration had led them to Abyssinia to labor for the reunion of that country to the Roman Catholic Church, out of which there was no salvation. They were not asked what they had to say to the Abouna who was present and ready to hear their message. "All we have to say to him," responded Father Cassien, "is contained in the Patriarch's letter to the Negus, the Abouna, and the people of Abyssinia." Ariminios and Heyling had prevented Basilides from opening these letters. They were now brought and publicly read. Matteos recommended equally to all to receive with honor Fathers Agathange and Cassien as men of holy life and irreproachable monks; he exhorted the King and his subjects to hearken to their doctrine as the only true one concluding by praying God to bless these apostles that they might do as much good in Abyssinia as they had done in Egypt where he had known and conversed with them long enough to be able to answer for their virtue and religion. Ariminios, who had listened impatiently to the reading of these letters, as soon as it was over, broke out into a furious invective against the Patriarch, "That monster, half Copt, half Roman"; adding that Father Agathange had taken advantage of his senility to fascinate and pervert him and was a scoundrel worthy of the greatest punishment. "I have seen him in Egypt," he pursued. "I know better than anyone his malice and hardness, and I have sad experience of it. . . . People should not be deceived; this Father was sent by the Pope of Rome to be Archbishop of the Abyssinian Catholics, as he was already of the Egyptian Copts." He ended by ordering, as bishop, that the chalices and ornaments, and all the objects of worship found in the luggage of the Catholic religious should be burnt or broken up as objects of witchcraft or abomination.

The Negus, without letting himself be carried away by this attack, continued the examination and asked the missionaries why they had dared to penetrate into Abyssinia despite the edicts forbidding entrance to all Roman Catholic foreigners. Father Cas-

sien replied that truly they knew of the edicts prohibiting entrance into the kingdom by Portuguese Jesuits, but that they were Frenchmen by birth and were not included in this prohibition, since their country never had any contest with Abyssinia; that, moreover, they were bearers of letters from the Patriarch of Alexandria, whose jurisdiction was recognized in the whole country, and that, consequently, they did not think they were disobeying the laws. "But why," continued Basilides, "assume the costume of Coptic monks? People are not thus disguised except for grave reasons and to conceal bad designs." "No, assuredly," responded Father Cassien, "We had no evil designs; we acted thus in obedience to the Patriarch, who thought we should have less to suffer and more facility of approaching you in that costume venerated by everybody, than in ours which is unknown to you."

After the examination, Basilides and his officers were thinking that it would suffice to send away the missionaries without inflicting any other punishment upon them, and, pending their expulsion, to keep them in prison. But this moderation was not pleasing to Ariminios, no more than to the Queen-mother and Heyling, who used their influence to move the people to a seditious tumult to clamor at the palace gates and furiously proclaim that the Negus was favoring Catholics like his father and that it was on that account he was keeping the prisoners at Gondar in order to later on do all that the Pope's emissaries would wish. They loudly demanded their immediate banishment and that of the bishop of Nissa and two other Jesuits still in the country. Ariminios's instructions had not been understood by the crowd, so the insidious prelate availed of the opportunity to return to the charge, exaggerated to the Negus the importance of the rising and told him that if he wished to preserve his throne and live more tranquilly than his father, he should not send the missionaries out of his kingdom, but compel them to profess the Coptic religion under the outward guise of which they had penetrated into Abyssinia, or on their refusal to put them to death; thus, the people would be appeased and the throne rendered more secure.

This expedient was deemed wise by the council. They at once sent to the prison for the friars and had them brought before the tribunal, again presided over by the Negus. They were asked if they were baptized and circumcised. Father Cassien replied that as Christians they were baptised, but not circumcised; circumcision being a ceremony of the old law, became not only need-



less but even prohibitory under the new law. The Abyssinian people adhere strictly to this Mosaic ordinance, although all do not submit to it; they regard it as a mark of greater perfection. On hearing Father Cassien the crowd grew indignant with the missionaries and called them Jews, children of fornication, pagans.

As soon as this clamor ceased, Basilides said, "What you say is very well, but it proves nothing; you have only to choose between the Alexandrine religion and the Roman religion. If you choose the former, you shall have life, liberty, riches and pleasures; if you choose the Roman Communion, death awaits you. Make haste, then, and decide for our worship, otherwise your blood be upon you."

Father Cassien promptly made an eloquent profession of faith, of submission to the council of Chalcedon which condemned the errors of Eutyches and Dioscorus, and to the Roman Church, out of which there is no salvation. "We are too little attached to life," he added, "that the fear of death should make such a great impression upon us, and if, as Capuchins, we have renounced the pleasures and possessions of this world, it was not now to acquire them by a shameful apostacy. We shall remain firm in our belief, and we prefer death a thousand times to forgetfulness of our God," The Negus, not irritated by this language, and perhaps touched by the constancy of the servants of God, or calling to mind the Catholic truths he had professed in his father's reign, turned to Father Agathange and asked him if he was of the same sentiments as his companion. The latter did not at once understand the King's words, the Ethiopian language not being sufficiently familiar to him; but, when Father Cassien explained them, he made his profession of faith in Arabic and Turkish, unable to make it in Ethiopian. They then conversed for a few minutes in a language which none present understood, after which Father Cassien said to the Emperor: "My companion thoroughly shares my sentiments; we have both been sent by the Sovereign Pontiff, not to seek your gold and pearls, which we despise like dirt, but to get you to enter into communion with the Catholic Church, the only true church, to follow the example of your illustrious father and grandfather; and if our words cannot convince you, we shall willingly shed our blood for you, and, dying, pray God that our death may be more effective than our speech. Ariminios would not let them continue, but rose in a fury and declaimed passionately against the Pope and the Catholics, and in conclusion said: "These two men who want to separate you from our traditions and precipitate you into error,

are not worthy of life, they deserve death"! The people applauded, the King did not venture to contradict him, and pronounced anew the sentence which condemned them to be hanged for not embracing the Ethiopian religion.

Both religious, hearing this sentence, fell on their knees to thank God for a favor they had long asked, gave each other absolution of their faults and the plenary indulgence granted by the Church to missionaries who die while engaged in missionary work; then, rising, Father Cassien began to again make profession of the Catholic faith, and, addressing the faithful mingled with the crowd, exhorted them to persevere to the last in their faith and in submission to the Church of God.

The executioners did not leave them time to make long speeches, but led them to the customary place of execution, stripped them of their garments, and prepared to hang them from the trees which served the purpose of gallows. In their precipitation they had forgotten the ropes; Father Cassien perceived it, and said smilingly: "There should be no ropes needed here, since we have two which we use as cords." The executioners seized them and threw them round the necks of the friars whom they hanged from the trees. But the ropes were too thick and the suffocation was not quick enough to gratify the fury of the people. Then the heretics, at the instance of the Abouna, who had threatened with excommunication those who would not aid in the execution of the French religious, took up stones ready to hand and stoned them until they were dead. They next cut them down from the trees and continued to shower stones upon them so that their bodies were soon completely covered, and even then everyone wanted to bring his stone and co-operate in this work of death. Thus died these two holy religious, victims of their zeal for the conversion of heretics and of their attachment to the Catholic faith. The crown of martyrdom, which they had so earnestly asked, at last encircled their brows.

God was not slow to shew for the glory of His servants. The very night following their martyrdom, brilliant lights, which attracted all the inhabitants of Dembea were seen over the heap of stones under which they were buried. The prodigy should have made them enter into themselves and recognize the truth of the missionaries' teachings; but they were content to admire and remark, "See what a fire these Jews make." The Catholics, on the contrary, were transported with joy, and strengthened in their belief, and came every night, with the heretics to look at these lights which lasted eight days. Basilides was informed of them

and despite the entreaties of Ariminios and Heyling, who sought to persuade him that it was only a specimen of the witchcraft or knavery of the Catholics, he would see for himself what it was and examine everything attentively, resolved to punish severely those who were the cause of this deception. But, after a conscientious examination, he was convinced of the reality of the fact and seized with admiration and dread; but was not converted on that account. However, on returning to his palace, he sent orders to have the bodies of the two Capuchins interred in a more becoming place. They set to work, and had removed a portion of the stones which covered them, when a sudden storm of extreme violence arose and dispersed the terrified schismatics; whereupon the Catholics, reassured by the prodigy and full of joy, carried away the precious remains out of the precincts of the city and interred them without external pomp but with lively gratitude for the grace which God had accorded them in the martyrdom of these two religious.

Other marvels likewise signalized their glorious death. On the night following it, Father Cassien appeared to the nun whom he had converted at Barba during his first captivity; he was radiant in glory and ascending to Heaven holding in his hand a glistening standard. Simultaneously another apparition of the martyrs appeared to the Capuchin nuns in Tours.

Ariminios, after getting rid of the French Capuchins, remained confronted by the Swedish Lutheran, Heyling or Peter Leo who had made profit out of the spoils of the Jesuits and by his learning acquired considerable influence over the court and the people. Immediately after the events narrated he tried to disseminate his errors and first attacked the worship of the saints, then combatted the honors paid to the Blessed Virgin and even forbade his pupils to recite the Hail Mary at the beginning and conclusion of class. The angry parents complained to the Abouna who, less through zeal than the jealousy which was already devouring him, the growing influence of Peter Leo detracting from his, echoed the people's voice, and, after a rather long resistance on the part of the King, finally obtained Heyling's banishment. Basilides, however, as a token of his good will, loaded him with rich gifts which, added to what he already possessed, would have enabled him to lead a life of pleasure wherever he liked. But the blessing of God did not rest upon this money, stained with the blood of His servants. When Heyling, escorted by a large number of slaves and carrying all his ill-gotten wealth with him, reached Souakim, the



Pasha—the same who had so well received the French Capuchins—knowing the share he had in their death, had him seized on his arrival and at once beheaded. The Turk then took possession of all his property, with the approbation of the whole town.

The martyrs long continued to be objects of veneration in Abyssinia and Egypt, even schismatics and Turks made pilgrimages to their grave. The Capuchins of Cairo, when they heard of their death, sought to secure authentic accounts of their martyrdom. Letters verifying it from Father Antonio of Virgoletta and Father Bonaventure of Lude, Capuchin, were sent in 1639 to Propaganda, and in the year following others from Father Sylvester of Sant 'Aniano, Capuchin, Father Antonio of Virgoletta and Father Antonio of Pietrapagana observantines. At the same time and shortly after was added the testimony of the exiled Patriarch Alfonso Mendez, who had retired to Goa. This prelate, on December 1, 1639, sent to Father Peter of Viviers and Father Zeno of Bange, Capuchin missionaries in India, an account he had received from Father Louis of Cardeira, a Portuguese, and Father Bruno of Santa Croce, Italian, two Jesuits who had been in Abyssinia at the time of the persecution, which record had been already sent to Urban VIII. The two Observantine Fathers, who had been sent to Abyssinia as missionaries Apostolic, were most diligent in procuring exact information for Propaganda and never relaxed their labors until they were able to send a complete, authentic and circumstantial relation of the acts of the two Capuchin martyrs, confirmed by a letter from the Most Rev. Francesco Antonio of San Felice, Archbishop of Mira, and Verbally by Father Elzear, Capuchin.

Nor was Rome, with its solicitude for all the Churches and its particular maternal solicitude for its missionaries, who form the vanguard of its sacred armies, slow to move. Already on June 27, 1639, the Cardinal of Sant 'Onofrio had communicated the matter to Propaganda, of which he was Prefect, and the Cardinals having diligently examined them, advised Innocent X to begin the Process of Beatification which, by a decree of February 17, 1648, was begun, and had already made much progress when on January 7, 1655, the Pope died. His successor, Alexander VII was petitioned by several distinguished personages in France, notably Louis XIV in a letter dated May 17, 1655, to authorize its resumption, which he did, but it was often interrupted on account of other and more urgent affairs. The process was again retarded by the death of Alexander on May 22, 1667. It was

only after the lapse of two years, on July 20, 1669, under the Pontificate of Clement IX that a definite result was reached when the Congregation of Rites replied, conformably to the conclusions of the Promoter of the Faith, to the relations or authentic records submitted to its consideration by Propaganda. Further information being required, a more extensive and circumstantial account was prepared by one of the Capuchins; and most important documents, long sought for, having subsequently been discovered, Leo XIII, by a decree of the Congregation of Rites, dated January 10, 1887, granted the petition of the Most Rev. Father Maurus of Leonessa, Postulator General of the Causes of the Servants of God of the Capuchin Order, that these documents be accepted in lieu of the Process of the Ordinary. It was reserved to Pius X, happily reigning, the seal of his Pontifical authority to the ultimate conclusion of the Congregation of Rites and beatify these two Capuchin martyrs.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork, Ireland.

---

## THE FRENCH ECCLESIASTICAL REVOLUTION.

**R**EQUISITE formalities not being completed last year, the measure carried in such hot haste through the French Parliament at the close of December is known as the Law of January 2, 1907.

In the Encyclical Letter, dated The Epiphany, January 6, addressed to the French Cardinals, Episcopate, Clergy, and people, the Vicar of Christ categorically condemns it as "a law of spoliation and confiscation that has completed the stripping of the Church. From the point of view of the exercise of worship this law has organized anarchy; it is the installation of uncertainty and caprice. Uncertainty whether places of worship, always liable to be diverted from their purpose, are, meanwhile, to be placed, or not to be placed, at the disposal of the Clergy and faithful; uncertainty whether they shall be reserved for them or not, and for how long: whilst administrative arbitrariness regulates the conditions of their use, which is rendered eminently precarious. Public worship will be in as many diverse situations as there are parishes in France; in each parish the priest will be at the discretion of the municipal authority.

And thus an opening for conflict has been organized from one end of the country to the other. On the other hand, there is an obligation to meet all sorts of heavy charges, whilst at the

same time there are draconian restrictions upon the resources by which they are to be met. Thus, though but of yesterday, this law has already evoked manifold and severe criticisms from men belonging indiscriminately to all political parties and all shades of religious opinion. These criticisms alone are enough for passing judgment upon the law.

It is easy to see from what has just been summarized that this law (of January 2, 1907) is an aggravation of the Separation Law, and we cannot, therefore, do otherwise than condemn it.

The vague and ambiguous wording of some of its articles places the end pursued by our enemies in fresh light. Their object, as we have already pointed out, is, the distraction of the Church and dechristianization of France, but without people generally attending to it or even noticing it. Their evil work does not respond to the wishes of the country. Universal reprobation, like a slow tide, is rising round them.

As to the annual declaration required for exercising public worship, though it does not offer all the legal security that can properly be desired, to avoid still greater evils to come the Church might have been induced to tolerate the said declaration. But, by the provisions that, the parish priest or the celebrant would not henceforth be anything more in his Church than an occupant without legal title there; that he would no longer be entitled to perform any administrative act there; a situation so vague and humiliating is created for the ministrants of public worship when exercising their ministry that under such conditions, it is impossible to accept the said declaration.

A pastoral letter to his diocesans from Mgr. Gieure, Bishop of Bayonne, which is the centre of a zealous and important Basque Catholic population, supplies an admirable supplement to the Encyclical. This Prelate points out: "Dechristianizing France goes on with as much perseverance as passion, bishops and religious are condoled with, for, undoubtedly, they are despoiled, hunted down, persecuted. But, in reality, the greatest injury will be suffered by the Christian population. To whom do these stolen properties really belong? To the people. From whom did they originally come? From the people. Who has mainly profited by them until to-day? The people. Bishops, priests, religious, will, if they must, get away safely and will, wherever they may go, take their religion with them. If recruiting the clergy be stopped through closing seminaries, if priestly ministrations be rendered impossible, how can the population practice religion? Who will distribute the sacraments? Who will aid the sick?



Who will bless remains of the beloved dead? If the people clearly understood all they would perceive that, in the long run, they will be the principal sufferers in this savage war. To such lengths has hatred of Jesus Christ brought us. To destroy His beneficent reign over souls, over the French nation, everything has been sacked or shattered; individual apostasy, national apostasy, have brought us to this pass at last."

Before the Epiphany Encyclical was published the Chambers reassembled, after the holidays, on January 8, when M. Passy—Deputy Senior in age—presiding at the opening, told his colleagues some wholesome truths about "the course of events and the new mechanism of parliamentary organization which have hurried political parties into manifestations that disturb the partisans and friends of a Liberal Republic." A few extracts from this bold discourse are relevant here, for they remind one "Still waters run deep," and reveal under currents of feeling that will not be unseen forever.

"Honor, in governing, means justice, and justice for every citizen ought to be the aim of a Republic. The only method of attaining that ideal of justice is Liberty; a word so attractive, so necessary, that all men, all parties, aspire to and claim its advantages, though everyone understands it in his own way; and liberty for you may mean servitude for me. We can say to-day, we shall say for a long while yet, with Madame Roland as she ascended gloriously the steps of her scaffold, 'O Liberty! how many are the faults committed, and that will be committed, in thy name!' Liberty does not exist without security for persons and for interests. Now neither the constitution nor our political customs give us this complete security. Parliamentary omnipotence, exercised on every subject matter under the pressure of political passion and pre-conceived systems, is a permanent danger for the security of French citizens. Liberty in the press is not enough for us, and to ensure that security there must be created, as in the United States of America, institutions for guaranteeing it. In this ministerial declaration the Premier told us 'the legitimate exercise of Liberty must first of all be guaranteed against administrative arbitrariness.' Well, a proposal to suppress the motto on our coinage, 'God protects France' was rejected in 1899 by the Chambers; in 1906 it was adopted without any Parliamentary report as preliminary, with Government's consent.

Yet the word and the idea of "God" are important factors in mundane policy, for, if suppressed from republican language

they will still remain a reason for concord in universal language, and it is a political mistake to break any bond of international solidarity. The Ambassador Count Tornielli, speaking on New Year's day for the whole diplomatic corps, finely told the President of the Republic, 'nothing happening to-day to any people is indifferent to the other peoples of the world. Deliberate appreciations and judgments prevailing among all nations of equal civilization form the commonalty of an universal public opinion.' Happily, the time has yet to come when the nations of the world shall all renounce the word and the idea of "God." And all who see brilliantly shining in infinite space those lights of hope and justice which nothing shall ever extinguish will continue to say from their hearts' inmost depths, "May God protect France!"

The allusion is, of course, to the following passage in the speech (that was placarded at cost of the State in every town, village, and hamlet, as well as in all cities) delivered by the Socialist, atheist, and Minister of Labor, M. Viviani, on November 3, 1906, in the Chamber: "Unitedly, our fathers, our elders, and ourselves, we have been devoted to the work of anticlericalism and irreligion. From the human conscience we have plucked our belief in another world. Together, with dignified attitude, we have extinguished in the heavens lights that no one shall again kindle." On this insensate falsity the Protestant Pastor of Monod, of Roven, well said: "To extinguish the lights in heaven Christ must be taken away, but that is an impossibility. If ever there was an attitude of dignity it is that of Christ dying on the cross at Golgotha, and giving to His brethren in humanity supreme consolations, supreme hopes."

To procure by lawful agitation constitutional reforms, of which M. Passy so courageously affirmed the crying need, is the chief work undertaken by the powerful Catholic association "Popular Liberal Action," whose founder and President (the Catholic Parliamentary leader) M. Pion, at their annual congress held last November in Lyons, described it thus: "Without constitutional reforms public liberties and citizens' rights are unguaranteed. The way whereby Parliamentary majorities manage to play ducks and drakes with essential liberties and the most sacred rights proves there is a worse tyranny than that of an individual, namely, a collective anonymous tyranny which coolly does as it pleases. France, deeming herself initiator of progress, and civilization's leader, lives under a regime none of the neighboring countries would endure a day. She is without, or at the best has only half a constitution. Turkey is the one European country

worse off in this respect than we are. Our legislators in 1875 hastily drafted and voted a law upon the organization of State powers, but they omitted guarantees of private rights. In 1797 the Chambers placarded on schools and town halls the famous declaration of the rights of man, but as that declaration was abrogated two years afterwards, and the abrogation has been confirmed by a series of subsequent constitutions and charters, the pompous placarding was a deception, it was one of those expedients whereby the masses are mystified and duped. The declaration is so much waste paper. A Frenchman has not one right of which he cannot easily be deprived." After declaring every liberty had been violated; liberty of association, liberty of teaching, liberty of public worship, M. Pion proceeded: "If we had a constitution, if we had a Supreme Court that would make our rights respected, if our electoral system were sincere and honest we should not have been perpetrated, one after another, the outrages against liberty from which our country so cruelly suffers. Freedom of conscience is imperilled when the despoiling State, professedly irreligious, pretends to represent the Christian community and to impose upon Christians a system of worship organized by itself."

However, to M. Etienne Flandin, deputy for the Yonne, belongs the honor of taking the first decisive practical step in Parliament in the direction of indispensable reforms.

Failing to obtain a hearing in December for his proposed amending clause to the Spoliation Law then being discussed with fire and fury, this genuine Statesman moved on January 15, a short project of law providing that public meetings might freely be held without preliminary authorizations, declarations, or other formalities, anywhere excepting on the public roads, but subject to being dissolved by the constituted authorities in case of trouble developing, or threatening to develop, into violence or blows.

Almost unanimously approved at once the project was referred to a committee, to whom exactly a week later the Government submitted (by a decree of the President of the Republic) a project of law of their own, drafted by M. Clemenceau, as follows:

Article 1. Public meetings, for whatever object, may be held at any hour without any preliminary declaration.

Article 2. Everything contrary to the foregoing that may be in the laws of June 30, 1881, Dec. 9, 1905, and January 2, 1907, is here abrogated."

With this project the Ministry submitted a lengthy statement of reasons and agreements for the altered course it had so suddenly been decided to steer.



The committee having expressed their satisfaction, M. Flandin withdrew his own proposal, and the Ministerial project being immediately considered, he was requested as their chairman to return it with their report thereupon, which he did on January 22, that the Premier might move this supremely important measure. M. Flandin's analytical report concludes: "This law doubtless brings a solution of temporary difficulties, but before all else it is a common law, creating no privileges, available for all Frenchmen, and increasing our patrimony of freedom. Let us be less suspicious of freedom, let us have a more generous faith in it. If France has, perhaps, profited less than other peoples by those ideas of emancipation she first preached it is because, too often among us, the mania of making rules for people and keeping them in leading-strings, has discouraged initiative and paralyzed progress." This bill, moved on January 29, after an excited discussion lasting two days was carried by 532 votes against 4, two brief amendments dealing with the duty of mayors to provide places for meetings, and with provisions for repairs having been added to the original draft as given above. On January 31, the Senate received the bill with a request from the Cabinet to discuss it without delay. For unless promulgated as law on February 3, the law of January 2 operates to suppress stipends to priests contravening its requirements of a declaration. However, the Senate, even more anti-clerical than the Chamber, shelved discussion by adjourning until February 7, so that Government must, applying the law of January 2, proceed as before against priests guilty of the (still legal) crime of celebrating Mass without a declaration. This move on the part of the Senate was possibly a pre-arranged one, for there have been grand squabbles not only in the Bloc but between Messieurs Clemenceau and Briand; now should a Ministerial crisis ensue and a change of Cabinet result, it might easily happen that this excellent bill could not become law.<sup>1</sup> The actual political situa-

<sup>1</sup> That any grand international matter has altered a fixed deliberate policy to destroy Christianity, pursued during a generation by M. Viviani, his father, elders, and associates, is unlikely; because, were any such cause known to these men of yesterday, it would surely be known at the Vatican. Rome is now a leading political centre. At this season the Eternal City is crowded by diplomatists and Statesmen of the first distinction. Now, at the Vatican, three or four days after the Briand circular nothing more, evidently, was known as to why it was indited than is known by the present writer. The French Government is credited there with sincerity, and with being animated by loyal intentions, so that peace is now considered possible and even probable. It was said, in the Papal entourage, two envoys from the French bishops are expected with information for the Holy Father and instructions to represent need of urgency for a Papal pronouncement, inasmuch as the fall of the Ministry before signature of the contracts would upset everything, which, once signed, restoration of existing incoherence would be very hard.

tion is one of latent and lasting Cabinet crisis, not alone due to the ecclesiastical revolution, but to Socialistic proposed legislation on several matters not at all to the taste of the Senate. In the language of a deputy of the right, the proposed income tax if suitable to the Socialists means, coalition of Senators against the Cabinet; if framed in a spirit of compromise means war to the knife with extremists in the Bloc; hence the Clemenceau Ministry is tolerably sick after three months of office.

The third meeting of the French episcopate, held at the Chateau de la Muette, Paris, January 15-19, resulted in a declaration (approved by the Holy See) of their unanimous consent to essay the organization of public worship in churches to be placed at the Bishops' disposal free; an essential condition being a legal contract (authorized by Government) between themselves or their clergy and the Prefects or Mayors to whom such churches (sequestered in December) have been handed or will be handed over; the contract to be for a term of eighteen years, during which term (being fixed by the common law for municipal leases of communal properties) neither Mayors nor Prefects shall in any way interfere either in parochial administration or in regard to the conditions of occupancy of the edifices, which must be, as regards police, under control of the priest in charge, the mayor intervening only on grave occasions when his official duties require him according to law to re-establish disturbed order.<sup>2</sup>

This document, published on January 29, was immediately with a form of contract, sent by each Bishop to the Parish priests in his diocese with a request to be informed immediately whether the proposed contract would be entered into by their respective

---

<sup>2</sup> Now, the declaration of the Bishops on January 29th, expressly proclaims their solidarity, and announces that if private worship is not to become general, the Mayors, the whole country, must universally accept the proposal their Lordships make as to leases. "All or none."

Governments have, of course, far better means of knowing the truth than the writer, who himself believes anything approaching to national unanimity in favor of leasing for eighteen years churches seized a few weeks ago in virtue of powers to despoil and confiscate given by an overwhelming national vote less than a year ago, is in the last degree unlikely.

These anti-Christians are, perhaps, confident there can be no such revulsion. At any rate it is highly suspicious the extreme anti-clericals in the Chamber refused to "interpellate," or they actually approved in conversation the circular of M. Briand, who was absent (having, it was given out, been obliged to go home, "suffering from influenza"; immediately after settling the draft contract in Council); although an adequate explanation of the Ministerial and party silence during the week ending with the departure of King Edward may be, that visit; which certainly, at such an inclement season, would not have been undertaken without good reason.

mayors, and instructing them if possible to get it signed at once and return it to the Bishop. Of course, from every parish where Catholics are strong and zealous the signed contracts were quickly obtainable or obtained. But so soon as the Minister of worship learned these proceedings, he circularized the Prefects of France on February 1:

"You will shortly receive instructions concerning the application of the Article in the Law of January 2, 1907, providing that free use of Communal buildings intended for worship, and of their fittings, may, subject to the requirements of Article 13 in the law of 9 December, 1905, be accorded by an administration act of the mayors to the ministers of worship specified in declarations of worship-meetings. It is extremely urgent, to prevent mayors being entrapped into giving their signatures, that you should telegraphically warn them, they are not entitled to enter into a **contract of this kind without preliminary deliberation by their municipal council**, and that they should, pending the vote of that body, confine themselves, if asked for it, to giving an acknowledgment of receipt of any request for use of edifices they may have received. You will also assure them they shall at a very early date receive instructions defining the conditions to be observed to render such contracts valid, and will direct them to do nothing until those instructions reach them."

It is due to M. Briand to acknowledge: first, that he lost no time whatever in fulfilling this promise; second, that his new circular on the application of the law of January 2, 1907, which bears date Paris, February 3rd, and was published the following evening, lays down regulations concerning the leases of Churches and Communal Chapels which on the face of these are fair, reasonable, and likely to be universally acceptable. The main conditions are, approval of the agreements by the municipal councils, failing which mayors cannot enter into them; maximum term to be eighteen years; the lessee (whether a cure, or a worship association) to keep the buildings in proper repair; leases for longer periods than eighteen years to be sanctioned by the prefect; that the cure acts by permission of his ecclesiastical superior may be stated in the lease, but such superior is not to be entitled in any way, once the document is signed to interfere, or exercise authority. It is not clear whether the bishop may himself contract with the Mayor, and there are words in one clause of the circular which may be taken (and perhaps are designedly used) to mean that the contracting cure must previously make a declaration as required by the law of January 2, 1907. If this be the



meaning, the lengthy circular is merely pompous waste paper.<sup>3</sup>

In Paris the appearance of the circular was hailed with satisfaction by Catholics and reasonable men. Paul de Cussagnac regards it as a departure to Canossa, all honor being, he says, due to the Episcopate's final noble attempt to save public worship, and as a practical summary of conditions embraced within pontifical teachings. Opinion generally is, the circular manifests a sincere intention of concessions upon the main issues, is the paraphrase of the Episcopal declaration of January 29th, and accords satisfaction to the principles laid down as necessary by the Holy Father. In the afternoon of Monday, February 6th, the Paris cures met at the Archbishop's, where they learned Cardinal Richard had determined to authorize "declaration de reunion." Monsignor Ametta, coadjutor of the Cardinal Archbishop who was slightly indisposed presided and declared that contracts with prefects or mayors on the conditions indicated in the circular, guaranteed sufficiently the dignity and security of the situation of the Church; the circular indicated in precise terms the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and expressly recognized the hierarchical principle.

Mgr. Amette concluded: "The contract gives the cure a juridical title to use the Church and, consequently, the right to perform administrative acts, so that he ceases to be a mere bird of passage in the Church, and is no longer in the vague and humiliating situation given to him in previous ministerial instructions. Such being the case the reasons for refusing a declaration have disappeared on which the Supreme Pontiff wisely laid so much stress. Accordingly Cardinal Richard deems it proper and useful to direct his priests to make the declaration, after the contract is duly signed, and when His Eminence shall authorize them to make it." In the political world the anti-clericals are displeased; disagreement between Messieurs Clemenceau and Briand is inferred, interpellations are spoken of. "A circular is not a law" people say. There is no denying that M. Briand has

---

<sup>3</sup> The French Cabinet on Tuesday, February 5th, settled the form of contract they desired. The only fresh feature in this document is the final novel, excessively objectionable, and most dangerous clause, as follows: "*La cession du benefice du present acte est subordonnee a l'adhesion du Prefet*"; that is to say, "The grant of the advantages accruing from the present contract is subject to the Prefect's adhesion thereto." In other words, Government, whose creatures the Prefects (several being Jews and Freemasons) generally, are, and each of whom holds office absolutely at the pleasure of Government,—reserves to itself power to tear up through Prefectures any or all of many thousands of leases before legal effect is given to the contract obtained after so much exertion! Probably every American and Englishman of business who reads the clause, be his profession or opinion what they may, will say, "This is not business," and will agree with Messieurs. Passy and Pion as to the need of Constitutional reforms.

acted more like a statesman desirous of religious peace than as a sectarian hungering for the applause of the dangerous maniacs of anti-clericals. Why this sudden volte face is taken remains a mystery, but the motive is in all likelihood one of an international character, and therefore providentially enforced upon the Freemason Pontiffs.

M. Briand had announced as soon as he saw the declaration that he considered it to be the first evidence of ecclesiastical dispositions to behave legally, although it was worded harshly, threateningly, and prescribed absolutely unacceptable conditions. M. Clemenceau in the Chamber next day, January 30th, denounced it as "An insolent ultimatum the Government kicks out of its way (*repousse de pied*): if it is said to be an overture to discussion the Government declines any; they tell us the Church asks for all or nothing; in that case the Government reply, nothing you shall have. The document amounts to nothing, or to no more than a bad newspaper article." In the course of his speech he remarked that M. Briand, author of the Separation Law, had never anticipated its condemnation in Rome. "M. Briand foresaw everything except what actually happened. Consequently it is perfectly true that we are floundering in quagmires. But it is not I who plunged into them. I was placed there and I remain there" (in 'incoherences').

Incoherent indeed is the political situation. While the anti-Christian Minister of Worship cogitates conditions that shall prevent the Mayor of Toul from contracting if he wishes in the twentieth century with the dispossessed Bishop for using the Cathedral for Christian devotions it is announced, "The Masonic Lodge of Toul has expressed the hope that the Cathedral will be converted into a public market."

The chapel of the Marist Brothers, 46 Rue Pernety, Paris, has been sold to a cafe-concert proprietor, and, after closing all seminaries and sending over 3500 inmates to barracks for two years, ministers announce that the seminary of St. Sulpice is to be turned into a picture gallery. From vulgar impertinence, political quagmires, intrigues, incoherence, inconsequence, sacrilege, and impious absurdities, it is a relief to turn to actions by a few men of sense and principle. Here are some.

The Prefect of the Dordogne, M. Estebble, in January, circularized the mayors of his department as follows:

"Communal Churches, notwithstanding that, in default of worship association they are now legally possessed by the communes, retain, along with their fittings, their former character.

They must remain open as formerly to the faithful and to the ministrants of worship. The cures or priests in charge are therefore not to be asked to give us the keys they have; both on account of containing to hold them and because of their occupancy of the Churches they incur responsibility to the communes, and are bound by a ministerial circular of December 1, last, not to allow third parties to damage the buildings or the objects furnishing the buildings. Accordingly, when exceptional circumstances arise, and while the present state of things lasts, there seems to be no need, notwithstanding the absence of sequestration, for you to organize a guardianship that would risk creation of obstacles to worship."

The Count of Pimodan, Lieut. Col. of Cuirassiers in January retired from the army, sacrificing his career to his convictions, and as a token of respect (*noblesse oblige*) for the cause in which his father, General Pimodan, laid down his life at the head of pontifical troops in the field of Castelfiardo. The Count was among the youngest officers of equal military rank, and has published accounts of his travels in Japan and Algeria. Capt. Le Texier, a Breton, resigned his commission rather than assist at an inventory, and Captain Magniez, in the North of France (who, like Captain Le Texier had arisen from the ranks) had to do the same because he refused to obey orders counter to his Catholic convictions of right and wrong.

M. Belard, Secretary to the Mayor of Ispagnac (Lozere) declined to assist in taking the inventory at the Church, protested against that proceeding, and was sentenced in December to a fortnight of imprisonment.

The Garde-Champetre, or rural policeman, of Saint-Martin du Bec (Seine-inferieure) a widower with ten children (a fact that speaks volumes) in 1905 had one of them sick with typhoid fever and his wife on her deathbed. The parish priest during several nights watched beside mother and son. Last December the poor man (who is no more clerically minded than his fellows) was ordered to witness his benefactor offering Mass and take notes for the purpose of prosecuting the offender. He refused and was instantly dismissed. So far as I know this martyr to gratitude has received from his Catholic countrymen and brethren no more aid in his terrible position than a ten franc piece from one of them.

M. Maurice Trubert was offered by the minister for foreign affairs the post of secretary to the French legation in Buenos-Aires, but resigned, considering, he said, "I, as a Catholic can-



not any longer represent abroad, where my future career should be, a government officially proclaiming its irreligion and treating the head of the Church as it does."

Such heroic examples of conduct unhappily are exceptional and more than rare. But it is an edifying fact that in the department of Magenne, where at the elections last year Catholics won all along the line, the Assize Court in January had to close after opening, there being no offenders to try.<sup>4</sup>

An heroic defence of hearth and home was made by the superior and 160 seminarists of the Angers diocesan seminary of Beaupreau on Saturday, January 19. The expulsion was to have been by surprise before dawn at 6 o'clock, and troops from Angers and Cholat were ordered to march thither during the night; but the country was on the *qui vive*, and the alarm was given at 3 in the morning by automobile from Angers. The tocsin being sounded Catholics flocked in to defend, and they succeeded in keeping the considerable force engaged at bay the whole day. The first assault being repulsed dynamite was used by the besiegers, all the windows within a radius of fifty to sixty yards being broken and the flooring of a neighboring house giving away. During the fight, the Sub-Prefect of Cholet, the commander of the gendarmerie, and the commissary of police were wounded, the last seriously. Reinforcements were sent for to Cholet and to Angers. About 2 in the afternoon the prefect of Angers and the commandant of gendarmerie there arrived with army sappers and miners, and at 3 a fresh attack was made, the soldiers with fixed bayonets and trumpets sounding the charge. The besieged, from dormitory windows flung on the assailants articles of furniture; fifteen soldiers in this assault being wounded and the colonel of the 77th Line Regiment getting his jaw bone broken. This attack was vigorously repulsed. The superior, to avoid more effusion of blood, then negotiated, and, after obtaining a promise

---

<sup>4</sup> In the department of Magenne, (that of exclusively Catholic deputies and of white gloved assize) in the first forty-eight hours 150 Mayors agreed and seven refused to contract. In that of Aveyron 420 accepted and ten refused. In the diocese of Auch, 180 accepted and ten refused. At Lyons on the other hand, the second city of France, and a Catholic centre with its Cardinal Archbishop, its shrine of Fouvrieres, its annual universal illumination on December 8th, and its primitive martyrdom rendering it an ideal City of the Saints, the Mayor on February 5th, informed his municipal council that three cures had, on behalf of all the Lyons cures, inquired whether he would contract, and had been told he declined to entertain their application or even to submit it to the council, which it would have been his duty to do had cures separately applied, each for himself. It is significant, perhaps, that the first example since Robespierre's dictatorship of an indispensable resort to private worship, was simultaneous with the Briand circular. At Pellestre, near Perpignan, the Mayor took on himself (illegally) to close the Church! so the cure has been forced to celebrate functions in private houses.

that no proceedings would be taken against any of the defenders, capitulated. The total number wounded was some 150, one-third seriously, the police commissary dangerously.

Despite the promise given by the prefect, early in the following week proceedings were taken by the authorities against M. Bonnet, manufacturer; M. Subileau, carpenter; M. Setieroe, hairdresser; M. Lampriere, painter; M. Saulard, mason; and Madame Bourget, cultivator, for manifesting against the despoiling force. A fortnight after the siege the War Minister, General Picquart, visited Angers and distributed sundry decorations and medals to the officers, soldiers and gendarmes who had distinguished themselves!

A significant contrast to this brave struggle was the seizure on January 24th, of the Minor Seminary of St. Anne-d'Auray, in the diocese of Vannès, Brittany, by the prefect of Vannes, the sub-prefect of Lorient, and M. Hennion, a director of the Paris police, specially sent; protected by an imposing force of 2,000 troops (200 being gendarmes) commanded by General Lamezac. Sainte-Anne d'Auray is a famous place of pilgrimage; on the annual feast 100,000 may be seen there. In so Catholic a district, naturally all the country people crowded in from the earliest hour; at half-past 7 the tocsin sounded; at 8 the peasantry poured in by all the roads; at 11 the troops. The seminary door being burst open, the great Basilica was entered by the soldiers, to take the inventory (already taken) being the purpose; and a skirmish between them and the people in the church followed; the Abbe Daniel and a few laymen, including the Marquis of Anglade, were arrested, together with his Lordship's sister, the Marchioness of Caverville, accused of striking with her parasol the police commissary.

M. Hennion expelled the vicar-general, the superior, and several professors, while the Catholics outside cheered the expelled students and chanted hymns. At half-past 4, the inventory was finished and all was over; the troops departed amid loud hootings, with cries of "Long life to the Prussians!" and "To Berlin!" The local account concluded: "The courage and nerve of the population has greatly increased, and their anger was intense when, contrary to expectation, a new inventory of the church properties was taken. It was a splendid, imposing manifestation of Catholic faith. One hundred and twenty gendarmes and two companies of sappers and miners slept in the Basilica which remained open all night."

This is a case, I submit, where a few works like to those at

Beaupreau would have impressed France and the world more than such "imposing" faith; while doing more for the cause of Christ.

Uncertainty, arbitrariness, incoherence, characterize the numberless cases where prosecutions for contraventions of recent laws have been instituted. Fines for the same offence of saying Mass have varied from a franc to ten francs, while probably there have been fewer condemnations than acquittals of accused priests or bishops.

In the provinces about a dozen minor churches up to the end of January had been closed. The first to enjoy that distinction being at Azay-sur-Indre (in Indre et Loire) under the following circumstances: The mayor, M. Boucher, on December 16th, wrote to the cures: "In execution of the law of 1881, and failing any worship-declaration I have the honor to inform you the commune of Azay-sur-Indre to-day takes possession of the Presbytery and Church which you are requested to quit at once. In case of your refusing, a statement of contravention will, conformably to law, be drawn up against you." The Archbishop gave unlimited leave of absence to the cure, who left the parish, and the church was closed.

The Paris courts have to settle a singular case arising out of the sequestration and proposed retention by the State of moneys bequeathed for Requiem Mass. M. Isely, a musical publisher, deceased in 1904, left by will 7,000 dollars each, to a lady, the faculty of medicine and the three *conseils de fabrique* of the three Parish churches of Notre Dame le Lorette, Saint Vincent Paul, and Notre Dame des Champs; each church to employ the interest of the 7,000 dollars bequeathed to it in Masses forever for M. Isely and his two parents. The lady and the faculty claim their respective proportions of the \$35,000; and the executor, M. Graux, seeks a judicial decision on the following points: First, Ought the 3x7,000=21,000 dollars bequest to be annulled, since no worship-associations have been formed that might claim the money; or, second, ought the will to be annulled on the ground of bequests to unknown persons? or, third, should the 21,000 dollars be handed over at once to institutions for benevolent uses (as provided in the recent ecclesiastical legislation)? In that case ought not the court to refuse to decide finally upon the will until the 21,000 dollars are actually handed over? The Government propose to "reserve" those 21,000 dollars.

A schismatic worship-association (the first of these bodies) was organized last November at Culey in the department of



Meuse, by the cure (repudiated by his bishop) and the municipality. The civil tribunal of Bar-le-Duc decided in January that, notwithstanding the Separation Law requirement of episcopal acquiescence, the sequestrator of the Church and properties must hand over to this worship-association, (excommunicated by the bishop) forthwith, all deeds, documents and moneys. This, although the Council of State (not consulted) alone has legal status to decide whether the Culey worship-association has been validly constituted; because the Council of State has not, up to the present, made any pronouncement against that course.

A personage tolerably well-known to ritualistic circles in America and England, viz: the Frenchman by race but American citizen by naturalization, styled "Archbishop Vilatte of the ancient American Catholic Church" arrived in Paris in December, and, in the parish of Notre Dame de Lorette, together with a few laymen, founded (of course, without consulting the cure or the Cardinal Archbishop) a worship-association that (equally of course) filed a demand for the handing over to it of the parish church and its possessions. In the meantime the Archbishop established himself at 22 bis Rue Legendre, formerly belonging to Barnabite Fathers (expulsed) and provided with a chapel, where a public function of high Mass was partly celebrated on Sexagesima Sunday by the Abbe Roussin, from the diocese of Toulouse, a priest under a cloud, who is to be the cure of the ex-Barnabite chapel, and who preached, in presence of his pontiff arrayed in full figure. Much disorder and tumult followed upon his appearance in the pulpit, which he was speedily forced to quit by missiles flung at him. The Archbishop having vainly, from the sanctuary, tried to quell the storm was also obliged to beat a retreat. M. Vilatte, born in Paris in 1854, was validly baptized, and educated by gallican-minded parents in gallican opinions. His sister, ultramontane he says, is an expelled Augustinian now at Cape Breton, formerly in the Montronge, Paris, convent.

He was ordained in the priesthood in June, 1885, by the Bernese Old Catholic Bishop Herzog, himself ordained and consecrated by the famous Reinkens; and seven years later was consecrated Archbishop in Ceylon on the Feast of Pentecost, by the Archbishop of that island and of Goa; Antoine, Francois-Xavier, Julius I, "By the grace of God," aided by the Eastern Bishop of Kottayam, and the Bishop of Ninanam Malabar, as is certified by M. Morey, United States Consul, Ceylon. This episcopal consecration is generally assumed to be valid, but the Cardinal

Archbishop of Paris, in the official portion of the February 2 *Semaine religieuse*, warns the Catholic public against the soi-disant "French Catholic worship" installed in the Rue Legendra by "a certain M. Vilatte, styling himself Archbishop, and a M. Roussin taking the title of non-Roman Catholic Priest. For, it appears from a document dated 3 September, 1889, signed by Monsignor Bonjean, Archbishop of Columbo in the island of Ceylon, that validity of the episcopal consecration of the oriental prelate who would have conferred episcopal consecration on M. Vilatte was doubtful, wherefore M. Vilatte's consecration is itself uncertain. However that may be, both M. Vilatte and M. Roussin are out of communion with the Catholic Church.

Offices celebrated by them are consequently illicit and sacrilegious, and Catholics are forbidden to assist thereat."

The majority of the congregation present at this debut of "French Catholic worship" were, however Catholics; but they did not "assist" sympathetically, on the contrary. The chapel was crowded with men, only a couple of score ladies venturing in and a few hundred persons had to remain outside, where a force of police kept the road clear.

In the nave were collected Jews, Protestants and persons professing no religion. M. Des Houx, the well-known apostle of schismatic associations, whereof he has formed about seventy that are officially recognized, though all but a dozen or less are still without priests, was in the chapel with his family. At 10.45 Messieurs Vilatte and Roussin entered the choir, accompanied by a sacristan and two choir-boys in scarlet cottas and white slips. After Asperges the Mass began, and after the gospel M. Roussin mounted the pulpit; when cries of insignificant oh! oh! began. The preacher declared the worship celebrated there would be Catholic; "we are tolerant, we shall say nothing to offend others," he said, and proceeded to eulogize Vilatte, "consecrated by the Patriarch of Antioch, successor of St. Peter," whereupon the row began. M. Roussin threatened to call in the police, and did so, which restored calm, and resumed, "Roman Catholicism is merely a part of universal Catholicism," a statement provoking fresh clamor; and M. Vilatte, advancing to the choir front, informed the congregation he had travelled as missionary during thirty-six years and had been through America and India, where, "you should have stayed," was shouted.

Taunted with being excommunicated he called out, "Yes, it is true and I am all the better for it." A wine dealer next twitted him with failing to pay his wine bill of some 300 dollars, the

police interfered, order was re-established, the office was resumed and concluded, after 200 persons had been expelled from the chapel.

M. Vilatte was excommunicated by decree of the Holy Office April 15, 1896. At Rome to-day the assurance is given his consecration was absolutely invalid, and that he is no bishop.

J. F. BOYD.

Plymouth, England.



## Book Reviews

---

"LES SAINTS." SAINT THEODORE, par *L'Abbe Marin*. Pp. IV., 195.

LE BIENHEUREUX FRA GIOVANNI ANGELICO DE FIESOLE, par *Henry Cochin*. Pp. X, 285.

LA BIENHEUREUSE VARANI, PRINCESS DE CAMERINO, par *la Comtesse de Rambuteau*. Pp. VIII., 187. Paris, Lecoffre, 1906.

The collection of Lives of the Saints whereto these volumes are the latest accessions possess a many-sided interest; nor need we go beyond these same volumes for illustration of at least three distinct types thereof—devotional, historical and apologetical. All of them manifest, though in different degrees, the latter quality, since the living embodiments of holiness which they portray are the most convincing testimony to the faith that alone fructifies in genuine sanctity. All of them, it need hardly be said, are devotional else did they not deserve a place in the series to which they belong. No less obvious, however, is the historical element which indeed would alone justify their existence and give them a unique value in the eyes even of those to whom the personal note in their respective subjects might unfortunately not so much appeal.

St. Theodore is almost an unknown saint to the modern mind. And yet he is one of the most striking figures of imperial Byzantium and the story of the Eastern Church in the Ninth Century. One of the last of the Catholics of Constantinople he was probably the very last ecclesiastical writer there who refused to become a tool of the Greek emperors. His eloquence, which rivalled that of Demosthenes and Chrysostom, was ever raised in warning against the perils threatening Christian faith and discipline, while he defended Catholic morality by his intrepid condemnation of the divorce of Constantine VI., and by his fearless scourging of the court theologians. He lived in the midst of persecutions which resemble in various aspects those that now beset the Church in France, and his sufferings are almost the exact parallel of those endured by St. Paul.

The works of St. Theodore constitute an entire volume of Migne's Greek Patrology. Here are found two early lives of the Saint. One, by the Monk Michael, a disciple of Theodore, was written a few years after the death of the latter; the other was left anonymous, but follows closely the earlier narrative.

The Abbe Marin, while utilizing the material furnished by these biographies, and the works of St. Theodore, embodies in the present volume the results of much original research into other

sources bearing on the history, religious and political, of the age of the Greek schism. The work thus enables one to view the great champion of faith, morality and liberty and his relation to the spiritual and secular surroundings of his times, their influence on him and his corresponding reaction.

What M. Marin has done for St. Theodore, the warrior saint of the ninth century, M. Cochin has done for Fra. Giovanni the artist saint of the fifteenth. The reader whose judgment has been prepossessed by an uncritical estimate of the "ages of faith" is wont to picture the blessed religious of Fiesole painting on his knees in his lonely cell those gentle Madonnas that have been forever associated with the sanctified genius of Fra. Angelico. Doubtless such an idealization has a foundation and expresses at least one side of the actual. But, as the author of the present life insists, Fra. Angelico is a Florentine, and a Florentine of the fifteenth century. He is a Friar Peachur, *et un Frere Precheur reforme*. He expressed what he himself saw and believed, as well as the aspirations of other religious souls at the opening of the fifteenth century, and the eve of the great schism. He is the symbolical historian of the Thomistic theology within his order, but likewise of the interior life and Christian thinking in Italy at the close of the Middle Ages. He is a witness of events and ideas which he in great measure wrought or moulded. He can never be understood unless one know the personages, events, doctrines that went to form his mind and his character—unless one study him in the contemporary trusty social and religious of his country, his order and the Church. It is the singular merit of the present biography that it enables one to see its subject in this historical environment. Though based on Vasant, who enjoyed exceptional advantage in getting at the original data, it has failed to utilize no source of information that reflects light on the times and life of Fra. Angelico. The evidence of thus thorough research is manifest in the bibliography which alone occupies five pages of the present volume. On the other hand the work of the scholar is not obtruded. The literary artist conceals without effacing the craftsman. The graceful style bespeaks the author's ideal not to make *un livre d'erudition mais de lecture*.

Bl. Varani was born just three years after the death of Fra. Angelico, 1458. She died in 1527. Her girlhood was spent at the gay court of Camerino where the worldly refinement of the Renaissance had succeeded to the bloody conflicts of the outgoing Middle Ages was characterized mostly by an incessant struggle between love and pleasure, and the promptings of divine grace.

The latter triumphed and her subsequent life was devoted to the religious duties of a Poor Clare. She left the record of her life in a diary which for its spiritual insight, open candor and simplicity remind one of the letters of St. Catherine of Sienna, and the autobiography of St. Teresa. The present Life by the Countess De Rambuteau is drawn mainly from that Journal supplemented by material from early biographies. These documents are harmoniously combined and accompanied by opposite reflexions of the gifted authoress. The whole recital is skillfully set in its geographical and historical framework—the Umbrian landscapes and the artistic atmosphere of the Italian Renaissance. The book is at once edifying, instructive and interesting.

---

CONSECRANDA. Rites and Ceremonies Observed at the Consecration of Churches, Altars, Altar-Stones, Chalices and Patens. By *Rev. A. J. Schulte*, Professor of Liturgy at Overbrook Seminary. With numerous Illustrations. 12 mo., pp. 297. Benziger Brothers: New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

In these days of the multiplication of books in every field so rapidly that it is impossible to keep up with them, it is more than ever necessary for an author to begin by proving a need. Dr. Heuser, the learned editor of the *Ecclesiastical Review*, is apologist in the case before us. He says:

“Most priests who have taken part in the Ceremonial at public functions of the Church must have realized at times a distinct want in our manual literature of liturgical practice. This want consists not so much in the lack of texts and commentaries which point out and interpret to us the ceremonies and rubrics of the liturgy, as rather in the need of one or more manuals which contain what we want for certain occasions, and that only, but that completely. The Pontifical and the Ritual prescribes definitely what is to be done in each case, but everybody who uses these official texts has experienced the embarrassment caused by the necessity of immediately locating the precise ceremony or prayers wanted, which are often merely referred to in the text; and which are to be found in some other part of the book, under a different function, or in one of the Appendixes. The advantage, therefore, of having a manual for the celebrant and ministers at any public function which contains all that belongs to one ceremony in compact form, with such directions as to leave no doubt about what has to be done *hic et nunc*, and with all the prayers in full, must be at once apparent from a practical point of view;



for it saves annoyances and delays which are at times a source of irreverence and disedification to the critically disposed spectator, and which prevent the dignified and prompt performance of the ceremonies of the Church.

Having thus created the need we must find the author. Here he is:

Father Schulte, whose experience for many years as instructor in Rubrics and professor of Liturgy in the Seminary, has enabled him to meet all the difficulties occasioned by the use of the liturgical text books as a manual in the performance of the various priestly and episcopal functions, has devoted long and serious study to their removal. With a mind singularly accurate and careful to obtain in every case the most approved authority and interpretation, he has set about preparing a series of liturgical manuals of which the present volume represents the first installment.

We feel inclined to add a word to this. Father Schulte is gifted in an unusual degree with the natural qualities required for a work of this kind. Then he has had practical experience that is exceptional. He was diocesan master of ceremonies for several terms when a student at Overbrook, and he spent several years in Rome, as alumnus and acting rector of the North American College. He has always been recognized as a model master of ceremonies in his own diocese, and has frequently been called upon to act on very important occasions.

The present volume is the result of his experience as a teacher of liturgy, and director of ceremonies.

In brief it contains the rites and ceremonies of some of the principal functions in which a bishop is celebrant. It is not merely a Ceremonial, but a Pontifical, containing complete directions, together with the prayers, psalms and antiphons in which the words are marked with the proper accents for chanting or reading. In describing the ceremonies the compiler has followed such recognized authorities as DeHerdt, Martinucci, Van der Stappen and Hartmann, and has consulted the latest edition of the authentic Decrees of the Sacred Congregation.

For the sake of greater clearness it seemed desirable to preface the subjects treated by some preliminary remarks, setting forth the matter in the light of Canon Law and the Decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. In the section entitled "Preparations," which usually follows, the compiler has enumerated all the articles that are necessary for the ceremony. In the section called "Function" the rites and ceremonies proper are described.

A large number of illustrations will assist materially in the interpretation of the rubrics. Indeed, a more practically useful work, tending to the edification of the Church, we can hardly conceive under present circumstances. The text is in Latin, of course, but all the directions are in English.

---

LA THEOLOGIE SACRAMENTALE. Etude de Theologie Positive, par P. Pourrat, Prof. au Grand Seminaire de Lyon. Paris, Lecoffre, 1906.

It is one of the stock objections urged by liberalistic Protestantism that the sacramental doctrines of the Church are of purely human origin, and her sacramental rites borrowed from paganism. Dr. Pourrat has set to himself the task of examining critically and scientifically the facts herein involved. His study is based on the traditional idea of the development of dogma formulated in the fifth century by St. Vincent of Lerins, and expounded so ably by Cardinal Newman in the nineteenth, and assumed by the Council of the Vatican: *crescit intelligentia, scientia, sapientia, —sed in eodem dogmate, eodem sensu eademque sententia*. As a fact the historical development of sacramentary dogma coincides with the logical. The doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, Sin and Grace developed successively in the explicit consciousness of the early Church. It was only at a later time that Christian reflection became formally centered on the Sacraments, the means of grace and of the remission of sin. The Sacramentary doctrine was explicated in the Middle Ages by the Scholastics, the representatives of Catholic tradition to their epoch, as the Fathers had been in the centuries previous. Nevertheless though the development of that doctrine was retarded, the Sacraments themselves were administered from the beginning by the Church who had received them from her Founder. The sacred rites were always there, but the systematic and philosophical form of the doctrine has been progressive. Three schools from the twelfth century onwards contributed to the development of Sacramentary Theology; that of Abelard, that of Saint Victor, and that of Peter the Lombard. The Sentences of the latter author mark the beginning of an epoch which was completed by the great Franciscan Theologians, Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure and Duns Scotus, and the no less great Dominican Bl. Albert Magnus, and St. Thomas Aquinas. The influence of these writers is indicated throughout the work here under notice. But much more than this is therein accomplished. The history of the definition of a

sacrament, that of the theory of the composition of the sacramental rite and the historical development of the dogmas as to the effect *ex opere operato*, the sacramental characters, the number of the Sacraments, their divine institution, the doctrine of intention—these important subjects are analyzed on a rigidly scientific method which follows them from their beginning up to the present day. The work is, therefore, in this respect, a practical illustration of Newmans theory of development. It also brings into prominence the sacramentary doctrine of St. Augustine and of the theologians of the eleventh and twelfth centuries—notably the Abelardian school—factors in the process of development that have hitherto been inadequately estimated. It will thus be seen that the book is in various respects an original contribution to the literature of positive theology, and therefore has special interest for the professor as well as the student, the clergy and religious as well as the educated laity.

---

LARGER CATECHISM. Part Second of the Abridgment of Christian Doctrine for Higher Classes. Prescribed by His Holiness Pope Pius X, for all the Diocese of the province of Rome. Translated by the *Right Rev. Thomas Sebastian Byrne, D.D.*, Bishop of Nashville. Fr. Pustet and Co., Rome, New York and Cincinnati.

The translation of this Catechism was undertaken at the suggestion of the Bishops of the Province of Cincinnati.

It was thought that the absence of scripture texts, usually cited in proof of the doctrines of the Church, might be an objection. As a matter of fact none are given except four or five, and these are cited as much in explanation as in proof of the palmary doctrines to which they are attached. The Catechism proceeds on the fundamental Catholic principle that the Catholic Church is the Divine Teacher of mankind; that she is invested with this authority by Jesus Christ, her Founder, that her sanction is the sufficient attestation of the truth of any doctrine and that, gifted as she is with the prerogative of infallibility, her authoritative declaration is infallible, and carries with it the same weight as a direct revelation from God. This is the true Church principle and one not sufficiently insisted on. In this Catechism it is constantly kept in view.

Moreover, the Sacred text, as Cardinal Newman says, was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and, if we would learn doctrine we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church, that is, to the Catechism and the Creeds.



The one important thing in the case of children is to teach them the doctrines of the Church, to bring them clearly to understand their meaning and import and their bearing on practical life; and, once this is done, they will be better able to give a reason for the faith that is in them, than if they know by heart a score of scripture texts and have only a hazy idea of the doctrines to which they apply and are intended to prove. And how few children are there, or even adults, who have a clear idea of the meaning, bearing and force of Scripture texts as applied to the doctrines in proof of their truth and divinity? \*

At any rate this seems to be the view the Holy Father takes of it, otherwise he would have directed that Scripture should be cited, in proof of the several doctrines set forth in the Catechism.

He seems to be familiar with the Catechism, to know it in detail, and to have selected it after mature deliberation.

He says, that after examining several texts, he has adopted this one already in use in many of the Provinces in Italy, and he makes it obligatory in the Diocese and Province of Rome, and expresses the wish that other Bishops will also adopt it, so that at least in Italy there may be one text. The qualification at least seems to imply that it is his wish that the Catechism should be adopted by the Bishops of other countries also.

And this is borne out by what he said to the two priests who had translated the Catechism into French, and went to Rome to present him with a copy of their work. They were presented to the Holy Father by the Bishop of Orleans, and the account goes on to say that he thanked them, blessed them, and expressed his gratification that his wish to have one Catechism for the whole world was in a fair way to be carried out. And this seems to be the fact for the Catechism has been for some time translated and published in German.

---

L'ÉGLISE ET L'ORIENT AU MOYEN ÂGE: LES CROISADES, par *Louis Brehier*.  
Pp. XIII, 373. Paris, Lecoffre, 1907.

The Library of Ecclesiastical History to which the present volume belongs was inaugurated in 1897 by the enterprising publisher Lecoffre. The aim of the series was to realize so far as this is possible by employment of private initiative alone, the project entrusted by Leo XIII to the Cardinals De Luca, Pitra and Hergenrother, viz.: the formation of "a universal History of the

Church, abreast of the progress of present-day criticism." The program has been distributed over a series of volumes each of which has been assigned to a scholar authoritative in the pertinent field, the object being not to furnish manuals for more or less elementary teaching nor for merely popular reading, but to provide monographic studies on the successive development of the Church and specially important phases of her history—studies that shall meet the wants of the educated student—cleric and lay. The realization of this aim has been largely assured by the fact that the "Library" is under the editorship of Mgr. Batiffol, Rector of the Institute Catholique of Toulouse, and one of the most scholarly writers at the present time in France. The actualization, moreover, of the design is evidenced by the dozen or more volumes of the series already issued, which deal, in a thoroughly critical method, with some of the most vital points of early and medieval history, and the majority of which have already passed through multiplied editions. The latest volume to appear, the one at hand on the Church and the East in the Middle Ages, and principally, of course, the Crusades, fully sustains the high standard of scholarship and literary excellence manifested in its predecessors. One need but examine the extensive bibliography placed as an introduction to the volume and arrayed at the beginning of the individual chapters and referred to minutely at every page, to be at least prepared to find which continues reading afterwards confirms, viz.: an original and, within the limits of its scope, a thorough treatment of an eventful and a too often misunderstood or misinterpreted period and movement of history. But while an immense multitude of sources are drawn upon for the luxuriant wealth of facts illustrative of the period in question the picture loses nothing in the way of unity, harmony or interest by the crowding of the canvas. M. Brehier has the sense of just proportion and of clear presentation for which his scholarly countrymen are deservedly noted. His work is at once instructive and attractive.

---

QUESTIONS D'HISTOIRE ET D'ARCHEOLOGIE CHRETIENNE. Par *Jean Guirard*. Pp. 304. Paris, Lecoffre, 1906.

The author of these essays, professor at the University of Besancon, is well-known to students of history by his work on the Holy See and the Renaissance and Life of St. Dominic, both which works, by the way, have been honored by the French Acad-



emy. He is also the author of a timely book dealing with the actual situation of the Church and State in France (*La Separation et les Elections*.) The volume at hand is a collection of essays covering a considerable variety of historical questions. The subjects, while independent are sufficiently connected to lend a sort of unity to the work. The first essay dealing with the Church's treatment of heresy during the Middle Ages, finds more than a merely temporal relation to the two succeeding subjects the moral doctrines and practices, Albigenses, and the initiatory rites of the Cathari. The fourth chapter wherein the relation of St. Dominic to St. Francis of Assisi is discussed, is easily associated with the three subjects just mentioned. The fifth essay containing a study of the great Roman Archeologist, De Rossi, associates naturally with the next chapter on the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter and with the subsequent chapter on Roman Relics of the Ninth Century. The chapter on the spirit of the Catholic Liturgy gives a fitting conclusion to a series of studies which are at once rich in fact, critical in method, logical in reasoning, temperate in tone, and pleasing in style—a valuable and a readable miscellany.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE CASUIST. A Collection of Cases in Moral and Pastoral Theology. 8 vo., pp. 339. James F. Wagner, New York.
- DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS. Edited by *Rev. James Hastings, D.D.* Volume I, royal 8 vo., 950 pages, with Map, etc. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- PROPOSED RE-PUBLICATION OF THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN ENGLAND, first Bishop of Charleston. Edited under the direction of the Most Rev. *Sebastian G. Messmer*, ArchBishop of Milwaukee, with Introduction, Notes and Index by *Rev. J. T. McDermott, D.D.*
- MEDULLA FUNDAMENTALIS THEOLOGIAE MORALIS, quam Seminaristis et Presbyteris Paravit *Gulielmus Stang*, Episcopus Riverormensis, S. Theologiae Doctor, Ejusque Lovanii Quondam Professor. Editio Altera et Aucta. Neo-Eboraci, Cincinnati, Chicago. Benziger Brothers.
- MEDITATIONS FOR THE USE OF THE SECULAR CLERGY. From the French of Father Chaignon S. J., by Right Rev. *L. De Goesbriand, D.D.*, Bishop of Burlington. In Two Volumes, 8vo., pp. 695 and 512. New revised edition. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.



70765

PERIODICAL

**DOES NOT CIRCULATE**

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE  
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM



